Date Due

NOV 27 1974

APR 25 1979

MAY 16 1979

Books returned after date due are subject to a fine of 5 cents per library open day.

Fairleigh Dickinson University Library
Teaneck, New Jersey

T001-15M
3-15-71

PR
2944
T27

Theobald, Bertram Gordon.
Shake-speare's sonnets unmasked, by Bertram G. Theobald, B. A. [1st. ed. London] C. Palmer [1929]
xi, 117 p.

1. Shakespeare, William, 1564-1616 - Authorship - Baconian theory. 2. Shakespeare, William, 1564-1616. Sonnets. I. Title.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/shakespearessonn0000bert

SHAKE-SPEARE'S SONNETS UNMASKED

SHAKE-SPEARE'S SONNETS UNMASKED

BY

BERTRAM G. THEOBALD, B.A.

CECIL PALMER
FORTY-NINE
CHANDOS
STREET
W.C. 2

FIRST
EDITION
1929
COPY-
RIGHT

K1001

Made and Printed in Great Britain at the KEMP HALL PRESS
in the City of Oxford

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
	FOREWORD	ix
I.	REASONS FOR CONCEALMENT	1
II.	THE SECRET SIGNATURES	9
III.	THE TITLE PAGE	21
IV.	THE DEDICATION	27
V.	EAR-MARKED SONNETS	41
VI.	THE TEXT OF THE 1609 QUARTO	67
VII.	A LOVERS COMPLAINT	75
VIII.	CONCLUSION	89
	APPENDIX A	95
	APPENDIX B	97

"Truth will out, even in an affidavit."

LORD JUSTICE BOWEN.

FOREWORD

IN the whole history of literature, by far the most brilliant figure is that of Francis Bacon. So extraordinary and so manifold were his intellectual gifts, that he stands head and shoulders above every author in modern times, a veritable giant among men. Equally true is it that in the records of those who are classed as benefactors of mankind, few have higher claim than this great soul, whose untiring toil for the good of humanity entitles him to the lasting gratitude of all succeeding generations. Yet, by a cruel irony of Fate, not only does his intellectual supremacy remain insufficiently recognized, but even his moral character has been attacked by unreliable historians. In this latter respect Macaulay is the worst sinner ; for his well-known essay, with its glaring inaccuracies and shameful slanders against Bacon's honour, has given a bias to most subsequent writers, who seem to ignore the fact that these calumnies have been refuted once for all by Bacon's ablest biographer, James Spedding, in that masterly but little read book, *Evenings with a Reviewer*.

Nevertheless, the day is not far distant when, by universal consent, Francis Bacon will be placed upon the topmost pinnacle of fame, and when his unrivalled intellect, no less than the loftiness of his character, will at long last be fully acknowledged.

But before that day can dawn a long-standing misconception must be cleared away. One of the most astute of Bacon's many devices for hiding his authorship was the selection of the obvious pseudonym "Shake-speare" (printed thus on most of the early Quartos and on the *Sonnets*) with its colourable resemblance to the name Shaksper or Shakspere, borne by the Stratford rustic, who was one of his many masks. Into this carefully laid trap not only the general public of those days, but

nearly all biographers, critics and commentators down to recent times, have innocently walked. Pardonable though this may have been in the earlier days, there is no such excuse now, since the question of the authorship of "Shake-speare" has been well ventilated for the last quarter of a century, and we ought not to humiliate ourselves further by continuing to glorify the mask instead of the man.

Slowly, and in face of stubborn opposition from orthodox quarters, the unjustly abused Baconian theory is winning its way. Not much longer will the collective common sense of the world tolerate the notion that a man devoid of all culture could produce the greatest masterpieces of literature —works displaying not only genius of the highest order, but deep erudition over an immense field, clearly involving many years of close study. The known facts of Shakspere's life contradict such a theory at every turn, and not all the word-spinning of his biographers can change these deadly facts. No amount of heaven-sent genius could account for such an anomaly. Meanwhile it seems necessary to increase still further the mass of cumulative evidence in favour of Bacon's authorship, until at length the inevitable conclusion finds general acceptance. The present little work is a small contribution to that end.

Among the many literary puzzles associated with the name Shakespeare, few have provoked more discussion and more widely differing theories than the little volume first issued in 1609 and bearing the title "*Shake-speares Sonnets.*" But it is not my intention to re-open any of the inquiries, many of them fruitless, connected with "The Dark Lady," or the "Master Mistress," or the "Rival Poet," or the so-called "Procreation Sonnets"; nor indeed any such questions. My aim will be directed simply to establishing beyond all reasonable doubt that Francis Bacon was the author of that volume, and that he has given us such ample and convincing proof in the book itself, that no unprejudiced person can, in common fairness, deny his authorship.

The nature of the proof is simple and easily understood; and if any sceptical reader will be good enough to follow the line of argument laid down in the following

chapters, and fully illustrated by pages reproduced *verbatim et literatim* from the original edition of the *Sonnets*, I am bold enough to hope, and even believe, that his orthodoxy will receive a severe shock. But mental shocks are good for us all, if only they are accepted in the right spirit. And if my claim should appear presumptuous, I can only say that the pages of " Shake-speare " tell their own tale ; my part is simply to furnish the reader with keys, by means of which he may unlock some of the mysteries contained in this amazing little book. I do not presume to have unearthed all the secrets hidden within its covers. Indeed my firm conviction is that more yet remain, to be disclosed at some future time. For the present, I am content to put forth the solutions of those riddles which careful study has enabled me to reach.

Cordial thanks are due to Mr. Alfred H. Barley for kindly reading the manuscript and making various helpful suggestions ; likewise to Mr. William Kingsland.

As this volume goes to press, I notice that in a book review (*Daily News*, 15 May, 1929) the Rt. Hon. J. M. Robertson refers to the " violent language of a recent writer on the subject of Essex and Bacon," and administers a well-deserved rebuke to those who " echo the ignorant conventional verdict, with an equal disregard of Spedding " ; and he rightly characterises the matter as " a critical scandal of the moment." From so strong a disbeliever in the Baconian theory this expression of opinion is especially significant.

B.G.T.

"BACONIANA," 1679

"And those who have true skill in the works of the Lord Verulam, like great Masters in Painting, can tell by the Design, the Strength, the way of Colouring, whether he was the Author of this or the other Piece, *though his Name be not to it.*" (my italics.)

ARCHBISHOP TENISON.

CHAPTER I

REASONS FOR CONCEALMENT

THE question is often asked : " If Francis Bacon was such a prolific author as is now claimed for him, why did he wish to remain anonymous ? " To answer this question fully and satisfactorily would require more space than can be allotted to it here. Briefly, it may be explained as follows. After young Francis had left college at the age of fourteen, having mastered all the knowledge which the best education of those days could give, he was sent to France with the British Ambassador, Sir Amyas Paulet, and in this way was brought into contact not only with the French Court, but with the intellectual circles of that country. During his two-and-a-half years' stay, he was introduced to the little coterie known as the " Pleiades," whose ambition it was to reform the French language, augment its scanty vocabulary from classical sources, and create a new literature worthy of the new language. Francis was fired with enthusiasm and resolved to do the same for the English language. When we bear in mind the undeveloped state of our mother tongue at that date, and the fact that England was far behind both France and Italy in culture, it will be realized what a gigantic task this lad was setting himself. But, as Spedding says, " He could at once imagine like a poet and execute like a Clerk of the Works " ; and even at that early age he was fully aware of his superb mental endowments and eager to use them for the benefit of the world. He felt himself to be a poet, his knowledge was already encyclopædic, and his pen ready for any demands upon it.

There were, however, grave difficulties in the way ; for his ambitions lay in more directions than one. As son of the Lord Keeper, Sir Nicholas Bacon, nephew of the First

Minister of the Realm, Lord Burleigh, and already a favourite with Queen Elizabeth, he had access to the innermost Court circles and acquaintance with all who were worth knowing, either there or in the small but very active world of literature. And there is no doubt that he ardently longed to reach some high position in the State, *not*, as most of his biographers unjustly imply, because he was a mere place-hunter, but because, as he himself once said, "place of any reasonable countenance doth bring commandment of more wits than of a man's own." He knew that a position of power and responsibility would enable him to carry out, or at least attempt, some of those vast schemes of reform in all departments of life which were his most cherished ideals.

But how could he do this and yet immerse himself in literature? In those days there was little encouragement for men of letters. Among a very select few of the educated aristocracy it was indeed permissible, and even fashionable, to compose light poems and pass them round in manuscript to intimate friends; but rarely did men of this stamp publish any of their work, though such publication was sometimes undertaken by others after their death. In any case, it would have been a horrifying suggestion for any man of high birth that the writing of such literature should be adopted as a profession and done for money. With the drama things were even worse. Theatrical performances were still of the rudest and coarsest description; while not only actors, but even playwrights, were a despised class, with whom few well-born men would associate, and certainly not on equal terms.

How, then, could the brilliant Francis Bacon, with the head of a Solon on his youthful shoulders, hope to achieve the literary task he had set himself? When Sir Nicholas Bacon died in 1579, Francis was left comparatively unprovided for, and was compelled to seek some means of livelihood. To be publicly known as a professional author, and still worse as a playwright, would have been fatal to all his high hopes of advancement in the State, and to securing the assistance he needed for his great reforms. Was he to abandon all this, or sacrifice his great literary aims? With characteristic boldness he decided to attempt both; and

while outwardly applying himself to the Law as a respectable profession, he deliberately renounced the fame which could easily have been his as poet and dramatist, and began at once to pour forth a continuous stream of writing from his ever fertile brain, but all of it either anonymous or pseudonymous.

It is clear, too, that had he adopted only one pseudonym, concealment would soon have become impossible, whether the name were a fictitious one or that of some living person. Hence, his early efforts were put forth under the names of such men as Robert Greene and George Peele ; not that he necessarily wrote every line ascribed to these authors, but that he used their names, by mutual arrangement of course, for some of his own writings. Following these, in the field of drama, came the works ascribed to Marlowe, and finally " Shake-speare " ; while his non-dramatic poems were fathered by the Irish Government official, Edmund Spenser. Thus, by distributing his literary personality in various directions, he was able to give full vent to his mental activities, and more easily escape detection.

At this point, some of my readers will hold up their hands and cry, " Impossible! How could one man, however gifted, produce such a volume as this ? " The answer is twofold. Firstly, the aggregate is not so large as would appear at first sight ; not so large, for example, as that of Goethe or Dryden. And what of the contemporary Thomas Heywood, who said that he had either written or had a share in writing over two hundred plays ? Or the Spanish author, Lopez de Vega, reputed to have produced more than a thousand dramas ? Bacon's acknowledged works, though weighty, are of no great dimensions ; and nearly all were written late in his lifetime.

Secondly, consider this remarkable fact. Here is a man admitted on all hands to possess one of the most finely balanced minds ever bestowed on any human being ; he has boundless ambition, superabundant energy, unwearying perseverance ; is known to be dabbling with " toys of invention " (i.e., imaginative writing) since various friends and relatives reprove him in consequence ; employs a

system of shorthand and dictates to a staff of amanuenses (except possibly in early youth) ; is a briefless barrister for many years, and scantily employed, for the most part, even when a Member of Parliament. He *must*, therefore, be producing an immense quantity of literature of some kind. Where is it ? With the exception of ten tiny essays published in 1597, he produces *nothing* under his own name until *The Advancement of Learning* in 1605, when he was in his forty-fifth year! This fact alone demands explanation, and on orthodox grounds none is forthcoming. Once admit his prolific output under other men's names, and everything is clear.

In one of the most beautiful prayers ever written, Francis Bacon says significantly, " This vine which Thy right hand hath planted in this nation, I have ever prayed with Thee that it might have the first and the latter rain ; and that it might stretch its branches to the seas and to the floods. The state and bread of the poor have been precious in mine eyes ; I have hated all cruelty and hardness of heart. I have, though in a despised weed [garment] procured the good of all men." Neither the lawyer's gown, nor the Chancellor's robes, nor the philosopher's garb can be considered a " despised weed." But a concealed dramatist was emphatically a man in a " despised weed," since play writing was a disreputable occupation in Tudor times.

Again, when King James was journeying to London shortly after the death of Queen Elizabeth, Bacon wrote to Sir John Davis, who was going to meet the King, and concluded his letter with the following curious phrase : " So, desiring you to be good to concealed poets. . . . " Could anything be more conclusive than this ? Such a phrase could never apply to a mere dilettante ; it must mean one who was devoting himself seriously to poetry.

And what do his friends say of him ? One of the most intimate and trusted of these was Sir Toby Matthew. In a postscript to a letter written by Matthew to Bacon on April 9th, 1623, there occurs this remarkable sentence : " The most prodigious wit that ever I knew of my nation and of this side of the sea is of your Lordship's name, though he be known by another." How could Matthew have

stated more definitely that Bacon was writing under a pseudonym? He phrased it as openly as he dared in the circumstances, and nothing can explain away the significance of this declaration. Matthew must have been "in the know," since Bacon was in the habit of submitting his works to him for criticism and suggestions before publication. On another occasion Bacon, in writing to Matthew, asks him to be "careful of the writings submitted to you, that no man may see them." And what can we say of the *Manes Verulamiani*, a collection of eulogistic poems published after Bacon's death, in some of which he is referred to as the companion of Apollo and the Muses, and by similar phrases unmistakably pointing to him, *not* as a lawyer, statesman, or even philosopher, but as an incomparable poet. Nothing can destroy the cumulative effect of all this testimony, reinforced as it is by a mass of evidence along other lines of research, all tending in the same direction.

One more point remains for consideration. The interesting theory has frequently been advanced that Francis Bacon was in truth the elder son of Queen Elizabeth by a secret though legitimate marriage with Robert Dudley, afterwards Earl of Leicester. As this question is still *sub judice*, one does not wish to dogmatize on it, especially as conclusive proof would naturally be very difficult to produce. But there are many very curious facts pointing in this direction, which cannot by any means be dismissed without careful examination. If this theory should finally prove to be well grounded, then all the reasons already adduced for Bacon's anonymity would be greatly strengthened, since he would in any case have been Prince of Wales *de jure*, if not *de facto*, during Elizabeth's life, and would anticipate being crowned subsequently as Francis I of England. But for many reasons it would be embarrassing for Elizabeth to acknowledge the marriage, and the fact remains that she did not do so. Such a theory would also explain why the "Virgin Queen" could never make up her mind to accept any of her numerous suitors! However, this topic must not be pursued further.

Essay "On Simulation and Dissimulation"

"Therefore set it downe ; That an Habit of Secrecy, is both Politick, and Morall."

Francis Bacon.

CHAPTER II

THE SECRET SIGNATURES

FROM what has now been advanced, it is clear that Bacon would take special precautions to establish his claim to all the anonymous and pseudonymous works already referred to, since he undoubtedly wished his authorship to be revealed in due season, though not until long after his death. Secrets of this nature must have been imparted to intimate friends and literary executors, if not also to a hidden society working in conjunction with him. But in those dangerous times many unexpected events might occur to frustrate the most carefully laid plans. Therefore it was natural for him to adopt some concealed methods, by which the works themselves should prove his authorship for those who could discover the keys to unlock these mysteries. When only a lad of eighteen, he invented what is commonly known as the bi-literal cipher, founded on the same principle as our modern Morse code ; and in various passages in his works, especially the *Advancement of Learning*, 1605, and the *De Augmentis*, 1623, he mentions different systems of cipher in such terms as to leave no doubt that he was himself using some or all of them ; and he even gives illustrations. Indeed the very passage containing the description is itself an example of cipher work.

We must remember, too, how in Elizabethan days even serious-minded literary men seemed to delight in ciphers, acrostics, anagrams, and word play of every description, to an extent which appears strange in this century. It is further to be noted that Anthony Bacon was constantly travelling over the Continent on political and diplomatic missions, and the two brothers maintained a considerable correspondence for many years. Much of this would necessarily be in cipher, as was customary in diplomatic

circles. Moreover, Francis himself was probably thus employed for a time, and his quick wit and ready pen were frequently requisitioned by the Queen in political emergencies of all kinds. Lastly, we may bear in mind a highly significant passage from his posthumous fragment *Valerius Terminus*, Chap. 18, as follows: "That the discretion anciently observed . . . of publishing part, and reserving part to a private succession, and of publishing in a manner whereby it shall not be to the capacity nor taste of all, but shall as it were single and adopt his reader, is not to be laid aside." Everything, therefore, points to the fact that Francis Bacon was addicted to habits of secrecy and that he was a master cryptographer. Hence, no surprise need be felt that such methods *are* found in his writings, both acknowledged and unacknowledged. This evidence is the more valuable in that it differs from the historical and critical research normally applied to such problems, and is more akin to mechanical or mathematical proof, though not being such in the stricter sense.

Coming now to details, one of the methods selected by Bacon for concealing his signatures was the ancient device of assigning a numerical value to each letter of the alphabet. To be precise, he employed the following three codes:

Simple Cipher

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	K	L	M
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	V	W	X	Y	Z
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24

Reverse Cipher

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	K	L	M
24	23	22	21	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13
N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	V	W	X	Y	Z
12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

K. Cipher

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	K	L	M
27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	10	11	12
N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	V	W	X	Y	Z
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24

Seeing that the first two of these codes were such elementary examples of cryptography, the marvel is that he was

not discovered more readily. But, as he himself says in *The Advancement of Learning*, "in regarde of the rawnesse and unskilfulnesse of the hands through which they passe, the greatest matters are many times carryed in the weakest cyphars." My own belief is that his extensive authorship was an open secret among the most select literary circles, and probably also to some extent in the printing and publishing trades ; but that as, according to all accounts, the charm of his personality, combined with admiration for his splendid intellectual attainments, eventually secured for him the warm friendship of most of the best writers of the day, his desire for anonymity was respected. As a matter of fact, both Marston and Hall, in their *Satires*, made veiled reference to Bacon as being the true "Shake-speare." So did Ben Jonson in *The Poetaster*. (See Appendix A.) But orthodox Shakespearean editors ignore such evidence as this.

The concealed signatures were simply the numerical totals of the letters in a particular name. Thus, for example :

Simple cipher.	*Reverse cipher.*	*K. cipher*
B = 2	F = 19	F = 32
A = 1	R = 8	R = 17
C = 3		A = 27
O = 14	B = 23	N = 13
N = 13	A = 24	C = 29
—	C = 22	I = 35
33	O = 11	S = 18
=	N = 12	—171
	—	B = 28
	119	A = 27
	=	C = 29
		O = 14
		N = 13
		—111
		—
		282
		=

Where were these signatures concealed ? Chiefly on the title page, first page, and last page of a book ; also frequently in the "Epistle Dedicatorie," or an "Address to the Gentle Reader," or in a Prologue or Epilogue.

If elsewhere, then some kind of hint would usually be given of their presence, and it was left to the ingenuity of the decipherer to discover them.

And how were they concealed ? By a plan so simple and so elastic, yet bound within certain definite limits, that endless variety was possible on the one basic scheme. It is clear that if Bacon had always formed his signature in the same manner, not only would the possible occasions for inserting them have been needlessly limited, but the danger of detection would have been far greater. For if some curious person had, either by observation or accident, come across one of these signatures, he would at once have applied the same method to other books of suspected Baconian authorship, and the secret would soon have leaked out. But by means of constant change within prescribed limits, a careless or faint-hearted decipherer would be thrown off the scent, while the persevering one would ultimately succeed ; and Bacon had to trust that this latter event would not happen during his lifetime. How accurately he diagnosed the dullness of men's wits in this respect is demonstrated by the fact that for more than three hundred years these signatures have remained hidden and been wholly unsuspected, except by the few who could guard the secret.

The plan was this. Students of Elizabethan literature are familiar with the fact that printers in those days made a greater use of italic type than we do ; and although the use of this, like the employment of initial capitals to words, was nominally governed by certain customs, yet it is evident from an examination of contemporary books that roman and italic types were mingled in a somewhat indiscriminate fashion, seemingly at the fancy of the printer. Bacon took advantage of this state of affairs and deliberately arranged the typography of his title pages, for example, so as to produce any four desired numerical totals, namely : (1) the total of all roman words on the page, (2) all italic words, (3) all roman letters, (4) all italic letters. Thus, by the interplay of these four factors, in other words by merely adding or subtracting any two totals (or taking one as it stood) a signature was revealed. One or two simple examples will make this plainer than much explanation.

Roman words	Italic words		Roman letters	Italic letters
1		THE	3	
3		Teares of the Mu-	13	
1		ses	3	
3		By ED. SP.	6	
1		LONDON	6	
2	1	Imprinted for *William*	12	7
3	1	*Ponsonbie*, dwelling in Paules	16	9
5		Churchyard at the signe of	22	
	3	*the Bishops Head*		14
		1591		
19	5		81	30

81
+19
100 = Francis Bacon (Simple cipher).

81
+30
111 = Bacon (K cipher).

81 = Marlowe (Simple cipher).

R.W.	I.W.		R.L.	I.
2		THE FAERIE	9	
1		QVEENE	6	
4		Disposed into twelve books	23	
	1	*Fashioning*		1
2		XII. Morall vertues	13	
		[ORNAMENT] VBIQVE FLORET		
2			12	
1		LONDON	6	
4		Printed for William Ponsonbie	26	
—	—	1590	—	—
16	1		95	1

R.L. 95 +R.W.16	R.L. 95 +I.W. 1	R.L. 95 —I.W. 1
111 = Bacon (K) = and F. Bacon (R)	96 = George Peele (S) =	94 = Marlowe = (R)

There is much other cipher evidence in *The Faerie Queene*, besides that which is shown here.

.W.	I.W.		R.L.	I.L.
1		THE	3	
3		Tvvoo Bookes of	12	
2		FRANCIS BACON	12	
4		Of the proficience and advance-	26	
5		ment of Learning, diuine and	23	
1		humane.	6	
	3	*To the King*		9
2		AT LONDON	8	
3	2	Printed for *Henrie Tomes*, and	13	11
0		are to be sould at his shop at Graies Inne	33	
	3	*Gate in Holborne.* 1605		14
—	—		—	—
1	8		136	34

---

31 + 8 = 39 = F. Bacon (S)

136 = Bacon-Shakespeare (S) and Wm. Shakespeare (S)

There are probably other secrets on this page, but they cannot easily be discussed here.

It may be objected that there is nothing to prevent such numerical signatures as these being found in any book by some other contemporary author. This is true ; and to guard against misconception Bacon usually arranged at least two different forms of his name on the same page, so that the suggestion of coincidence might be eliminated as far as possible. Not only so, but it will be admitted that a few, or even many, stray signatures in other men's books would prove nothing ; indeed a certain number must inevitably appear by the ordinary laws of probability. In order to prove intention, an author would certainly use such a system as this, not spasmodically but methodically throughout all his works. Bacon does so with profusion, both in his acknowledged and unacknowledged writings ; whereas if the works of any *one* other author be examined right through, it is safe to say that no such regular sequence of these special numbers will be found. Such tests as have already been carried out tend to confirm this view.

Another possible objection is that these particular numbers may just as well represent the signatures of other men besides Bacon. Naturally, if one examines the cipher signatures (on this system) of all the poets and dramatists of that period, a few cases of overlapping will be found. But none of these present any real difficulty ; for it must be borne in mind that this method *alone* cannot afford conclusive proof of authorship ; it is simply one item of evidence. If, therefore, any critic should point out, for example, that 119 stands for *Lodge* in K cipher, as well as for *Fr. Bacon* in reverse cipher, this does not really affect the position. For, in the first place, we should have to find cipher signatures for *Lodge*, or *Thomas Lodge* methodically on the title pages and first and last pages of any works now attributed to Bacon (or one of his masks) which the critic wished to claim for Lodge ; and, secondly, we should have to produce a goodly array of independent evidence likewise pointing to Lodge as author of those particular writings. This must have been one of the considerations which led Bacon to arrange not only for one but for many of his various signatures to be given, and in a variety of ways, on his multifarious literary productions.

Bearing on this is another point of interest, which needs

a few words of comment. From what has been said, it would appear that Bacon had two alternatives before him ; either to limit the number of these secret signatures as much as possible, in order to lessen their significance when found in other men's books, or to increase them as much as possible, so that their very numbers should carry conviction. Apparently he chose the latter course ; and my own investigations so far seem to indicate that he went a step further, and often planned not only his own personal signatures, but those of one or more of his masks in addition, on the same page, even though this increased the chances of finding *some* signatures in other books. Also, it is very rare to find signatures of his pen-names without one of his own. Almost invariably the pages contain his own signature ; and they frequently contain, in addition, one or more of his pen-names. Probably this was done for two reasons ; firstly to give confirmation of his authorship of works published under these men's names, beyond what would be found in the books themselves ; and secondly, as an additional protection to himself. For if he were taxed with being the author of such a work, he could evade the challenge by pointing out that the work contained other signatures besides his own, and that the presence of his own was therefore by no means conclusive evidence. Now, however, when we discover these names systematically employed in conjunction with his own, the inference is plain ; they are all pen-names of one and the same author.

Having thus cleared the ground in advance, it is hoped that the reader will be in a position to appreciate more fully the weight of evidence which follows in favour of Bacon's authorship of *Shake-speares Sonnets.*

Before proceeding to this, there is one more statement which must be made. The credit for first discovering the existence of these signatures belongs to Messrs. Frank Woodward and Parker Woodward, who in 1916 published a most interesting work, profusely illustrated, under the title of *Secret Shakespearean Seals* (Leicester : B. Halliday) ; while in 1923 Mr. Frank Woodward gave the results of his further researches in *Francis Bacon's Cipher Signatures* (London : Grafton & Co.). Both these works contain a

quantity of valuable material, most of which is very convincing ; though, as these authors would doubtless agree, certain portions might need modification in the light of further experience. Having grasped the general principles involved, I have now made my own investigations in various directions ; and, while gladly acknowledging my indebtedness to these authors for some of the signatures on the first and last pages of the *Sonnets*, and the penultimate page and a small portion of the last page of *A Lovers Complaint*, I am responsible for the remainder. The numerical acrostics are a discovery of my own.

"Novum Organum," Chap. cx.

"But such is the infelicity and unhappy disposition of the human mind in the course of invention, that it first distrusts and then despises itself: first will not believe that any such thing can be found out; and when it is found out, cannot understand how the world should have missed it so long."

Francis Bacon.

R.W. I.W. R.L.

SHAKE-SPEARES

SONNETS

Neuer before Imprinted.

AT LONDON

By *G. Eld* for *T. T.* and are to be ſolde by *William Aſpley.*

1609.

CHAPTER III

THE TITLE PAGE

COMING now to a detailed examination of this volume, we begin with the title page ; and the first thing which arrests attention is the hyphen between SHAKE and SPEARES. What author in the world ever bisected his *own* name in this fashion and put a hyphen between the two parts ? This feature alone should be enough to tell us that the word is a pseudonym. Next we notice that there is a very decided division of the page by the two lines right across it. I have usually found such hints to mean that secret signatures are in each separate part, in addition to any on the page as a whole. It only needs a few moments' inspection to see that in the upper section there are just 39 roman letters, and in simple cipher 39 = F. Bacon. The lower section is not so obvious, but I think there is no doubt the following is intended :

All letters 49
—All words 16

33 = Bacon (Simple cipher)

This is a slight variation of the usual method, which is to take any two of the four totals, but it is found elsewhere. Probably there is a third signature, obtained by making use of the whole page and of the date 1609. Figures are sometimes used for these purposes, and the procedure is to take the sum of all the digits (this method is practised even now in certain quarters). In the present case, the digits in 1609 total 16 ; and by adding this to the total of roman letters, namely 69, we have 85 = Fr. Bacon Kt. (S). As

mentioned in the previous chapter, it would seem that Bacon planned not only his own signatures, but also those of various masks which he adopted from time to time. Accordingly, by taking the whole page we have the following :

R.L. 69	R.L. 69	R.L. 69
+Fig. 16	+R.W. 15	+I. L. 19
85=Fr. Bacon, Kt. (S)	84=Spencer (R) and Peele (R)	88=Bright (R)

The significance of this last is that Bacon was almost certainly the author of *A Treatise of Melancholy*, published in 1586, under the name of "T. Bright" (i.e. Timothe Bright), as also of the enlarged version of this work subsequently put forth under the name of Robert Burton and known as *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. To many these statements may appear dogmatic, but it would be quite outside the scope of the present little work to furnish detailed evidence.

Thus we see how, on this apparently innocent title page, there lie concealed two or three of Bacon's own signatures, and those of three of his masks. This procedure, with variations, will be found throughout the book.

The question may now be raised by those who are familiar with the history of *Shake-speares Sonnets* as to what happens to this cipher evidence in the case of those copies which bear the *Wright* imprint instead of the *Aspley* imprint.

The latter appears in the Grenville copy in the British Museum, from which the various facsimiles in the present work are reproduced ; but the whole edition was probably divided about equally between these two booksellers. The question is a perfectly proper one and the answer is simple. On those copies bearing the *Wright* imprint, Bacon has arranged a slightly different and even more convincing display of his signatures. The accompanying reproduction shows this clearly.

.W.	I.W.		R.L.	I.L.
1		SHAKE-SPEARES	12	
1		SONNETS	7	
3		Neuer before Imprinted	20	
			39	

2		AT LONDON	8	
4	4	By *G. Eld* for *T.T.* and are	11	6
5	2	to be solde by *John Wright*, dwelling	56 19	10
4		at Christ Church gate.	18	
		1609		
20	6		95	16

Upper Section
R.L. 39 = F. Bacon (S)
Lower Section
R.L. 56 = Fr. Bacon (S)

R.L. 56
+I.W. 6
62 = Bright (S)

R.L. 56
=R.W. 15
41 = Peele (S)

Whole Page
R.L. 95
+I.L. 16
111 = Bacon (K)

All L. 111
=All W. 26
85 = Fr. Bacon Kt. (S)

It is important to bear in mind that throughout most of Bacon's life he was constantly being spied upon by one of his few enemies ; for the crafty and malicious William Cecil undoubtedly used every means to keep his brilliant cousin from becoming too close a rival to his (Cecil's) own political ambitions. And if Francis Bacon was in truth the elder son of Queen Elizabeth by Robert Dudley, and therefore a possible heir to the throne, his every movement would be watched with ceaseless vigilance ; since in those dangerous times of plots and counterplots, both religious and political, not only treason but minor offences of many kinds frequently brought their luckless authors within grips of the dreaded Star Chamber.

We must not imagine that in constructing all this cipher material, Bacon was gratifying an erratic and extravagant mental idiosyncrasy. It was a *necessity* for him—a question of outwitting those who were prying into his secrets, political or literary ; and if we in these days can enter upon this inquiry in a similar spirit of adventure and bring a little of the Sherlock Holmes element into our researches, together with some sense of humour, we shall be far more likely to discover these secrets than by stolidly refusing to believe in their existence. Francis Bacon used marvellous skill in hiding his messages for future ages. We shall need our best wits to decipher them.

As an instance of how other men of the period used secret methods of signature to literary works, I may quote the following, given by Mr. Harold Bayley.[1]

" The first three editions of Camden's *Remaines* were published anonymously, yet the learned author secreted his name within them under the phrases *Dum illa evincam* and *Nil malum cui Dea*, both of which mottoes will be found to be perfect anagrams of ' *William Camden* '."

[1] *New Light on the Renaissance.* London, J. M. Dent & Co., 1909 ; p. 196.

" The life of Shakespeare is a fine mystery, and I tremble every day lest something should turn up."

CHARLES DICKENS.

5 TO.THE.ONLIE.BEGETTER.OF.
3 THESE.INSVING.SONNETS.
5 Mr.W. H. ALL.HAPPINESSE.
3 AND.THAT.ETERNITIE.
1 PROMISED.
1 BY.
3 OVR.EVER-LIVING.POET..
1 WISHETH.
2 THE.WELL-WISHING.
2 ADVENTVRER.IN.
1 SETTING.
1 FORTH.

28

2 T.T.

30

CHAPTER IV

THE DEDICATION

IT is an acknowledged fact that, in order to establish their authorship of any new work, the poets of ancient Greece made a practice of concealing their names in the opening lines ; and the usual method was some form of anagram. Whether they did more than this has been a matter of speculation. Recently, however, Prof. D. S. Margoliouth has lifted this question out of the mists of conjecture into the clear light of demonstration by giving detailed proof that the Prologues of both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* contain cipher material in anagrammatic form.[1] He followed this demonstration by showing that the Colophons to these two works likewise contained hidden messages.[2]

Francis Bacon adopted this plan of conveying secret information in the vestibules of his works, possibly by anagram but certainly in a variety of other ways. In this chapter, I propose to exhibit a wonderful specimen of his skill in the famous dedication to these *Sonnets*, seemingly by the publisher Thomas Thorpe, and seemingly addressed to the enigmatical " Mr. W. H." This dedication has always been a puzzle ; and not unnaturally so, if the words be taken at their face value, with no thought of what may lie beneath. But the truth is that the whole of it has been constructed with consummate skill for the sake of its cipher message and is a veritable masterpiece of cryptography. We will first examine it on the basis already explained.

There are no italics, and therefore we cannot obtain the usual four totals, R.W., I.W., R.L., I.L. But there is one small letter, the " r " in " Mr.", and so we can at any rate differentiate between large and small letters. This is

[1] *The Homer of Aristotle*, by D. S. Margoliouth. Oxford : Basil Blackwell, 1923,
[2] *The Colophons of the Iliad and Odyssey*, deciphered by D. S. Margoliouth. Oxford : Basil Blackwell, 1925.

not an arbitrary way of treating the page, and similar examples are found elsewhere. Taking the dedication itself, without the initials " T.T.", we have R.L. (large) = 143 = F. Bacon (K) and Spenser (K.) Probably also

R.L. 143
+ R.W. 28
171 = Francis (K) is an additional hint.

If the " T.T." be included, we obtain :

All R.L. 146
+All R.W. 30
176 = W. Shakespeare (R) and
—— Edmund Spenser (R).

Thus far the ordinary method.

Next look at this dedication from another point of view. Everyone knows how poems have been written in which the initial letters of successive lines spell out a particular name. Clearly Bacon could not give away his secrets in so public a manner as this ; and therefore he cleverly varied that plan by constructing *numerical* acrostics in some of his works. These may be formed by the total cipher values of (1) first letters of all first words, (2) first letters of all last words ; (3) last letters of all first words, (4) last letters of all last words. Apply this to the whole dedication, with its signature, and we have :

First letters of first words (S) = 166 = Francis Bacon Knight (S).
First letters of first words (R) = 159 = Francis Tudor (R).

(Assuming the theory of Bacon's royal birth to be true, I shall, in the course of this inquiry, give " without prejudice " the appropriate signatures as they occur. The reader may assign what value he pleases to them.)

But this is not all. If we take the dedication by itself, without the initials " T.T.", three more of these marginal acrostics appear, as follows :

Last letters of first words (S) = 129 = Francis Bacon Kt. (S)
Last letters of first words (K) = 311 = Francis Bacon Kt. (K)
First letters of last words (K) = 282 = Francis Bacon (K)

a most remarkable piece of evidence.

We now come to the most astounding part of this dedication, if not of the whole volume. Bacon sometimes gave special prominence, by large capital letters and by setting out, to specified words on a title page, because those chosen words, when computed in one or other of the three codes, were signatures *in themselves* ; i.e., the total cipher value of all the letters of the word, or of a whole line, spelt out his name in some form. In this case he has applied that method to the whole of this dedication. In order that the reader may examine and check this for himself, the full details of the first five lines shall be set out.

LINE 1	LINE 2	LINE 3
REVERSE CIPHER	K. CIPHER	K. CIPHER
T = 6	T = 19	M = 12
O = 11	H = 34	r. = 17
T = 6	E = 31	W = 21
H = 17	S = 18	H = 34
E = 20	E = 31	A = 27
O = 11	I = 35	L = 11
N = 12	N = 13	L = 11
L = 14	S = 18	H = 34
I = 16	U = 20	A = 27
E = 20	I = 35	P = 15
B = 23	N = 13	P = 15
E = 20	G = 33	I = 35
G = 18	S = 18	N = 13
E = 20	O = 14	E = 31
T = 6	N = 13	S = 18
T = 6	N = 13	S = 18
E = 20	E = 31	E = 31
R = 8	T = 19	370
O = 11	S = 18	= Bacon-Shakespeare (K)
F = 19	426	
284	= Francis Bacon Knight (K)	
= Francis Bacon Knight (R)		

LINE 4
SIMPLE CIPHER

A	=	1
N	=	13
D	=	4
T	=	19
H	=	8
A	=	1
T	=	19
E	=	5
T	=	19
E	=	5
R	=	17
N	=	13
I	=	9
T	=	19
I	=	9
E	=	5
		166

= Francis Bacon
Knight (S)

LINE 5
K. CIPHER

P	=	15
R	=	17
O	=	14
M	=	12
I	=	35
S	=	18
E	=	31
D	=	30
		172

= F. Bacon Kt. (K)

Thus we have :

Line 1 in R.	=	284	= Francis Bacon Knight (R)
„ 2 „ K.	=	426	= Francis Bacon Knight (K)
„ 3 „ K.	=	370	= Bacon-Shakespeare (K)
„ 4 „ S.	=	166	= Francis Bacon Knight (S)
„ 5 „ K.	=	172	= F. Bacon Kt. (K)

Here, then, is the profoundly illuminating fact that the first five lines of this dedication yield five of the most telling signatures which could possibly have been devised. No one can deny, or even minimise, the immense importance of this evidence. By no miracle could such a series occur accidentally. It was therefore planned with great care and skill. By whom ? Either by Thomas Thorpe, the ostensible publisher, or by the author. We know little of this man Thorpe, but, unless he was a most accomplished cryptographer, he could never have contrived such a brilliant

piece of work as this. If he really did, then we have the independent testimony of a contemporary publisher (on the orthodox theory) that the true author was Francis Bacon. If he did not, then undoubtedly the author himself contrived it ; and so, once more, that author was Francis Bacon. The evidence of these five lines alone is incontrovertible. Should anyone wish to argue that Shakspere was the author and Bacon the procurer of these sonnets for publication, and that Thorne constructed this cipher as a compliment to Bacon, I can only ask him to read further. He will soon find such a theory untenable ; for the cipher evidence in this volume must be taken as a whole, and Thorpe was assuredly not responsible for all of it.

Now to proceed with the remainder of the dedication. It will be noticed that after line 5 there is a slightly larger space than between the previous lines. This is probably a hint of some kind of alteration, though there does not seem sufficient reason for believing that the whole method is to be changed. I think the solution is as follows. All the signatures in the first five lines are symmetrical, i.e. the value of the line is counted in one code and the resulting signature is in that same code. It is now a point for consideration whether non-symmetrical signatures, i.e., those in which the count is in one code and the signature in another, are legitimate. Undoubtedly the symmetrical one is cleverer and therefore may be considered stronger evidence. But, as I have shown elsewhere[1], non-symmetrical signatures are almost certainly used in special cases, such as the ciphers in an epitaph, where the object is to condense as much information as possible into a small compass. Therefore I do not think they can be ruled out altogether. They must not, however, be admitted in ordinary circumstances, otherwise the finding of chance signatures would be unreasonably multiplied.

The point of these remarks is that the remaining lines do not yield symmetrical signatures (there are limits to the skill of even the most expert cryptographer) but they do yield a series of highly interesting non-symmetrical ones.

[1] See article entitled, *The Monuments to Bacon, Shakespeare and Spenser*, in *Baconiana* for February, 1929.

To save space, these are given without detail, but of course the reader now has the means of checking them for himself. All of them are found in Bacon's various works except the first and last, which are conjectures of my own.

Line 6 " BY " in K = Tudor (R)

If, as seems to be intended by the contriver of this riddle, we are always to take each line by itself, then the word " Tudor " is the only word I know of which could be pertinent to our inquiry ; though of course I may be at fault here. Both in simple and reverse ciphers the word " BY " counts 25, a number to which I can assign no meaning in this connection ; whereas the word " Tudor " is at least appropriate.

Line 7 " OUR EVER-LIVING POET " in R = 205

The only solution I can suggest would involve too much discussion and illustration to be included here.

Line 8 " WISHETH " in S. = 88 = Bright (R)

Line 9 " THE WELL-WISHING " in R. = 185 = T. Bright (K)

The double signature seems to prove definite intention to indicate Timothe Bright, especially as " T. Bright " was the form used on the title page of *A Treatise of Melancholy.*

Line 10 " ADVENTURER IN "

in S. = 143 = F. Bacon (K) and Spenser (K)
in K = 273 = William Shakespeare (R)
in R = 157 = Fra. Rosicrosse (S)

The juxtaposition of Bacon, Shakespeare, and Spenser all on this one line is very telling, especially as the third signature is that of the Rosicrucian Fraternity.

As regards Bacon's authorship of works attributed to Spenser, only a few ideas can be thrown out here, but it is hoped that the reader will follow them up for himself. In 1914 the late Mr. Edward G. Harman, C.B., published an

erudite volume entitled, *Edmund Spenser and the Impersonations of Francis Bacon* (London : Constable & Co.) where the question was carefully discussed. It has also frequently been noted how slender is the documentary evidence pointing to Spenser, and how largely his biographers rely on internal evidence. Indeed, in the Globe Edition (London: Macmillan, 1920) Prof. Hales remarks (p. xv) : " Our external sources of information are, then, extremely scanty. Fortunately our internal sources are somewhat less meagre. . . . His poems are his best biography. In the sketch of his life to be given here his poems shall be our one great authority." Surely this is a very unjudicial attitude to adopt, even granting the paucity of external evidence. It savours too much of the methods by which large volumes, mainly filled with conjecture, have been written in the vain attempt to harmonize the known facts of Shakspere's life with the works of " Shake-speare." Many of the facts of Spenser's life contradict the evidence of the poems ascribed to him, whereas the facts of Bacon's life not only fit, but explain almost all difficulties. Moreover, I have recently discovered a mass of cipher evidence, of the same nature as that dealt with in this little book, all giving most ample demonstration of Francis Bacon's right to be known as the true author.

With respect to the Rosicrucian Fraternity, of which Francis Bacon was probably the head, it is believed that many of the most important works of the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods were issued under their auspices. In any case there is ample evidence that numerous books of high literary, philosophical and religious value contained, either at the beginning or at the end (very often both) the numbers 157 or 287; less frequently the number 168. These signatures are as follows :

157 = Fra. Rosicrosse (S)
287 = do. (K)
168 = do. (R)

Line 11 " SETTING " in S = 90 = Marloe (R)
in K = 168 = Fra. Rosicrosse (R)
in R. = 85 = Fr. Bacon Kt. (S)

Here the Rosicrucian signature is confirmed in another

code, and a further Bacon signature is given. It is, of course, a commonplace of literary criticism to say that Marlowe (or Marloe or Marley) was the immediate precursor of "Shakespeare," and that the latter owed much to his contemporary. We ought, accordingly, to feel no difficulty in believing that this man, of whose life, character and abilities there seems, unhappily, little that is good to relate, was another of Bacon's early masks. The evidence for Marlowe's authorship is meagre in the extreme.

Line 12 "FORTH" in S = 64, in K = 116, in R = 61

Neither 64 nor 61 suggests anything appropriate, and 116 is rather a puzzle. In reverse cipher 116 is *Thomas Kyd*, and there seems to be some probability that Bacon used this name at least so far as *The Spanish Tragedy* is concerned. But one may doubt whether he would care to commemorate such a slight connection with this man. Still, this is a possible solution. But I venture to make another suggestion, which may possibly provide an alternative interpretation for this line, and solve the riddle of "Mr. W. H." as well.

It may be permissible to remind those who are not students of Bacon, that he was fond of punning and word play. Connected with his own name and the word *hog*; and there is a well-known story of his father (or foster father ?) Sir Nicholas Bacon, which bears on this point. I give the story as it appears in *Resuscitatio*, 1671, where it is printed as No. 36 of Francis Bacon's *Apophthegms*. "Sir *Nicholas Bacon* being appointed a Judge for the Northern Circuit, and having brought his trials that came before him to such a pass, as the passing of Sentence on Malefactors, he was by one of the Malefactors mightily importuned for to save his life, which when nothing that he had said did avail, he at length desired his mercy on the account of kindred: prethee, said my Lord Judge, how came that in? Why if it please you my Lord, your name is *Bacon* and mine is *Hog*, and in all ages *Hog* and *Bacon* have been so near kindred, that they are not to be separated. *I* [aye] *but*, replyed Judge *Bacon*, *you and I cannot be kindred except you be hanged; for* Hog *is not* Bacon *until it be well hanged.*"

We all remember how a reference to this anecdote is dragged into *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, and how *Quickly* makes the absurd remark, " Hang-hog is latten for Bacon, I warrant you." And note that in the 1623 Shakespeare Folio, which is so crowded with cipher proofs of Bacon's authorship, there is a capital B to *Bacon*. To those who are familiar with Francis Bacon's methods it is significant that this scene occurs on page 53 of *Merry Wives* since 53 is a mystery number with Bacon, a fact to which numerous such examples testify. Probably one chief reason was that this is the simple cipher value of the word *Lux*, a word inscribed on secret Rosicrucian emblems (see *The Real History of the Rosicrucians*, by A. E. Waite, page 421). It is also to be noted that on this page 53, the word " Bacon " is the 264th word in Roman type from the top of the column, and 264 = Bacon-Shakespeare (R). Finally, the uncouth word " *latten* " instead of *Latin* is almost certainly another hint, because this word (S) = 68 = F. Bacon Kt. (S). So that, by substituting this signature for the word " latten " the line actually reads : " Hang-hog is Fr. Bacon Kt. . . . "

This sort of thing is not far-fetched, as students of these subjects know full well. It was all part of a general secret scheme for demonstrating his authorship, and is quite in keeping not only with Bacon's witty nature, but with the practice of his times.

Returning now to the dedication of the *Sonnets*, the point to which I desire to call attention is that we have the following curious facts :—

In simple cipher,	Mr. = 29	Hang = 29
	W.H. = 29	Hog = 29
	58	58

There is a cipher code, sometimes called the " Short Sum " count (A = 1 . . . . I = 9, K = 1 . . . . S = 9, T = 1 . . . . Z = 26) in which 29 = Fr. Bacon ; and some students apply it to these investigations.

Personally, I have not found evidence that this code is used systematically in Baconian works ; but I am bound to

say that the number 29 has obtruded itself on my notice in such a way as to suggest that it may be intended for a kind of signature. But in any case, we have just seen how "hang-hog" is a jesting allusion to Bacon; and if this is equivalent by word play to Bacon, and by cipher to "Mr. W. H.", surely it is a reasonable conjecture that "Mr. W. H." = Bacon. Why not? The grammatical construction of this dedication is very involved, but it is generally assumed that the publisher, Thomas Thorpe, is wishing all happiness to "Mr. W. H.", and further, it is assumed that this latter gentleman is the person who has *procured* the sonnets for Thorpe to publish. But this latter assumption is by no means to be taken as the whole solution; for a study of contemporary literature shows that in those times the word "begetter" might mean either (1) procurer, furnisher, provider, or else (2) producer in the sense of father or creator, and hence author. Both these interpretations have had their advocates, though as it has hitherto been impossible to identify "Mr. W. H." with the author, the former view has naturally received more support. But if we *can* discover the author under the cloak of "Mr. W. H.", then the word "begetter" will answer to *both* of the above alternative meanings, and everything fits quite naturally. For myself, I cannot avoid the conclusion that Thomas Thorpe is wishing all happiness to the author in the guise of "Mr. W. H.", that author being Francis Bacon; or rather, that Bacon, who was almost certainly the contriver of this ingenious puzzle, puts this interpretation into the mouth of Thorpe by way of intentional mystification. In other words, Bacon, with characteristic humour, is slyly wishing himself "all happinesse . . . in setting forth"!

I venture to think this suggestion is more reasonable than reversing "Mr. W. H." into "Mr. H. W.," and forcing a reference to Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton, as has been attempted; for how could an Earl possibly be addressed as "Mr."? The solution here put forward is also, I submit, better than to identify "Mr. W. H." with William Hall, who is sometimes alleged to have procured the Sonnets for Thorpe. We may well ask why the

immortal Sonnets should be dedicated to a nonentity such as this William Hall. There is nothing to warrant such a theory. It is for these reasons that I make an alternative conjecture with regard to line 12 of the dedication. For, since 58 in simple cipher = " Mr. W. H." and also "Hang-hog " (both = Bacon) then 58 + 58 = 116 might not unreasonably stand for a double reference to Bacon.

It is quite possible that a small confirmation of the suggested interpretation of line 12 may be found in the fact that in this volume Sonnet 116 is misprinted 119. The sceptic will of course say that the 6 was been inadvertently printed upside down. But experience shows that such apparent misprints are often intentional. Head-pieces and tail-pieces of books having some connection with Bacon are sometimes printed upside down, as a hint. Therefore one cannot dismiss even a trifling fact like this without consideration. In this case, the point is that 119 = Fr. Bacon (R) and so the alteration may be an indication that 116 is a covert allusion to Bacon.

It will be well now to set out the whole dedication again, with the interpretations given to each line.

TO.THE.ONLIE.BEGETTER.OF. in	R. = 284 = Francis Bacon Knight(R)
THESE.INSUING.SONNETS.	K. = 426 = Francis Bacon Knight(K)
Mr.W.H.ALL.HAPPINESSE.	K. = 370 = Bacon-Shakespeare (K)
AND.THAT.ETERNITIE.	S. = 166 = Francis Bacon Knight (S)
PROMISED.	K. = 172 = F. Bacon Kt. (K)
BY.	K. = 51 = Tudor (R)
OUR.EVER-LIVING.POET.	R. = 205 = Solution deferred
WISHETH.	S. = 88 = Bright (R)
THE.WELL-WISHING.	R. = 185 = T. Bright (K)
ADVENTURER.IN.	S. = 143 = F. Bacon (K)& Spenser(K)
	K. = 273 = William Shakespeare (R)
	R. = 157 = Fra. Rosicrosse (S)
SETTING	S. = 90 = Marloe (R)
	K. = 168 = Fra. Rosicrosse (R)
	R. = 85 = Fr. Bacon Kt. (S)
FORTH.	K. = 116 = ? Thomas Kyd (R)

If the reader will now be good enough to review, not only this but all the other cipher material given in the present chapter, I cannot but think he will freely admit its great weight and significance. Again I emphasise the importance of the first five lines with their carefully arranged symmetrical signatures. We must also bear in mind that all the above signatures are actually contained in the various

lines of the dedication. This is not a question of opinion but of fact. The only point upon which discussion can arise is, whether any of these numerical totals have different interpretations from those which are here assigned to them. As to this, I can only ask the reader to try whether he can find any other names which will fit *all* the circumstances of the case and provide a reasonable solution. If he can, it would be very interesting. If he cannot, then the above solutions may be allowed to stand. Also, if we were to rule out all the non-symmetrical signatures, even though the first five lines would still remain as a formidable argument for Bacon's authorship, it is hardly reasonable to suppose that the remaining lines have no significance at all.

Owing to the number of typographical peculiarities and apparent misprints, it is usually assumed that Thorpe and his printer were dealing with an unauthorized and incorrect manuscript copy of the original. For a few comments on this point, see Chapter VI.

" Our Shakespearean scholars hereabouts [Boston, Mass.] are very impatient whenever the question of the authorship of the Plays and Poems is even alluded to. It *must* be spoken of, whether they like it or not."

Oliver Wendell Holmes.

SHAKE-SPEARES,

SONNETS.

R.W. I.W.

6 FRom faireſt creatures we deſire increaſe,
6 1 That thereby beauties *Roſe* might neuer die,
8 But as the riper ſhould by time deceaſe,
7 His tender heire might beare his memory:
8 But thou contracted to thine owne bright eyes,
8 Feed'ſt thy lights flame with ſelfe ſubſtantiall fewell,
6 Making a famine where aboundance lies,
10 Thy ſelfe thy foe, to thy ſweet ſelfe too cruell:
8 Thou that art now the worlds freſh ornament,
7 And only herauld to the gaudy ſpring,
7 Within thine owne bud burieſt thy content,
7 And tender chorle makſt waſt in niggarding:
8–96 Pitty the world, or elſe this glutton be,
10 To eate the worlds due, by the graue and thee.

2

7 VVHen fortie Winters ſhall beſeige thy brow,
8 And digge deep trenches in thy beauties field,
8–33 Thy youthes proud liuery ſo gaz'd on now,
9 Wil be a totter'd weed of ſmal worth held:
8 Then being askt, where all thy beautie lies,
8 Where all the treaſure of thy luſty daies;
8–33 To ſay within thine owne deepe ſunken eyes,
7 Were an all-eating ſhame, and thriftleſſe praiſe,
8 How much more praiſe deſeru'd thy beauties vſe,
9 If thou couldſt anſwere this faire child of mine
9 Shall ſum my count, and make my old excuſe
6–39 Proouing his beautie by ſucceſſion thine.

201 1

CHAPTER V

EAR-MARKED SONNETS

IN the previous chapter I pointed out that it was an ancient classical custom for an author, when producing a new work to conceal his name in the opening lines of the poem by some kind of anagram or similar device ; and that this custom has been followed by Bacon. That is to say, he almost always inserts one or more signatures on the first page, but varies the method in which this is done. We expect, therefore, to find considerable evidence of authorship on this page ; nor are we disappointed.

There appears to be no invariable rule as to whether or not the heading is included in these cases. But I generally find that where it is somewhat elaborate, perhaps comprising several lines, and with both roman and italic types, it is meant to be used. But where, as here, there is nothing more than the running title of the whole book, it is usually omitted. On other pages, the running title is rarely used, except sometimes on the last page. Accordingly we commence our count with the first line of Sonnet 1 and continue to the bottom of the page, which is line 12 of Sonnet 2.

The result is :

R.W. 201
—I.W. 1

200 = Francis Bacon (R)

Next we notice that this page also groups itself into a series of signatures, as follows : Counting from the bottom (for convenience in this instance) the first five lines up total 39 = F. Bacon (S) ; the next four lines total 33 = Bacon (S) ; the next four also 33. In the remaining thirteen

lines there is one italic word, and so these signature result :

R.W. 96	= George Peele (S)	R.W. 96	
+I.L. 4		—I.L. 4	
100	= Francis Bacon (S)	92	= Bacon (R.)

But this is not all. Look at that one italic word. It is the word *Rose*. For those who are familiar with Bacon's habits, this is what might be called a Rosicrucian hint. And sure enough, by counting the *letters* in the first eight lines of this first sonnet, we arrive at 287, which was noted in the previous chapter as being Fra. Rosicrosse (K). Thus, at the commencement of this important book, is placed the imprimatur of the Roscrucian Fraternity. We shall also find it at the end. (It seems to be a rule that in a count of letters, large initial letters at the commencement of a stanza, page, or paragraph, are omitted. Hence, the first line contains 35 letters, not 36.)

Another little point, by no means without significance. The first two letters of the sonnet are FR, and the capital letter immediately below the initial F is B, thus making a sort of miniature acrostic, FR.B., that is, Fr. Bacon. This little trick of Bacon's is well known and appears elsewhere. Look at the opening lines of *A Lover's Complaint* in this very volume, and the same FR will be seen. The remainder of the device shall be pointed out when we come to that poem. A still better known example is the first stanza of *Lucrece*, where the FR B is prominently displayed for those who have eyes to see.

Finally, on this page are found various numerical marginal acrostics of the kind already described. They are :—

Sonnet 1.

First letters of first words	(R)	= 200	= Francis Bacon (R)
Last letters of first words	(K)	= 292	= Wm. Shake-speare(K)

Sonnet 2.

Last letters of last words	(S)	= 129	= Francis Bacon Kt. (S)
Last letters of last words	(K)	= 311	= Francis Bacon Kt. (K)

In these acrostics initial letters are always counted.

Finally, we see (in the original edition) as a heading to this page the familiar A A emblem, so intimately associated with important works either from Bacon's pen or produced under his supervision.

Having thus obtained strong and varied evidence for Bacon's authorship on the first page, the question arises, " What is to be done with regard to all the other pages in the book ? Are signatures to be found elsewhere ? And if so, how shall we know whether they are inserted by design or happen by chance ? " In this particular work the answer is not far to seek ; for it will be seen that, with comparatively few exceptions, the remaining pages are printed entirely in roman type ; so that two of our usual four factors (italic words and italic letters) disappear at once.

Not only so, but a glance will show that the total roman letters on any page would be more than 1,000, far too large for any signature. Accordingly nothing remains but the total of roman words ; and the only possible way for a signature to occur is, if a page total, or perhaps a sonnet total, should reveal something. Naturally this might, and indeed must necessarily happen sometimes by the ordinary laws of probability, since the number of words on a page ranges approximately between 260 and 290, and those in a single sonnet from say 110 to 120 or thereabouts. Any discoveries of this kind would therefore carry no weight and may be ignored.

But it is just here that Bacon comes to the rescue and tells us in the plainest possible manner exactly where he has hidden further signatures. Let the reader inspect any facsimile copy of this first edition of 1609, and he will find that every now and then an isolated italic word will appear, for no apparent reason ; occasionally two or three on one page ; but only in some twenty pages out of the whole book. As might be expected, a careful examination of these pages will reward the student with a rich harvest of interesting discoveries ; for on *every page* where an italic word occurs, these cipher signatures will be found, concealed in a variety of ingenious ways.

Here I may just pause to comment on the unfortunate habit of modernising the spelling, punctuation, typography,

setting out, and so forth in old books. From the point of view of cipher investigation, this at once ruins all such work as we are now engaged on ; and so, for study purposes, nothing is safe except the original works or a facsimile. Great obstacles are thus placed in the way of inquirers along these lines. But quite apart from any question of cryptography, surely one of the interests in studying the literature of bygone ages is to observe the development of language in manifold ways ; and how is this possible if the archaic forms of words and peculiarities of typography are obliterated by the modern editor ?

With regard to signatures concealed in marginal acrostics, it is clear that these also may, and indeed must, frequently occur by accident. Therefore we shall only note those which are found in sonnets containing italic words, since it is these to which Bacon calls our attention. Also, we will rigidly exclude all non-symmetrical ones. It will therefore be understood that in every case the signature is in the same code as the count of letters, and this will not be specially marked by the letters S, R, and K.

In order to simplify this inquiry, and also to avoid any appearance of arbitrary procedure, it will be well to mention that I take, besides the surname *Bacon* alone, his usual signatures, *F. Bacon*, *Fr. Bacon*, and *Francis Bacon*. As it is impossible to talk about Shakspere's " usual signatures," I take the names appearing on the titles pages of works ascribed to him, namely, *Shakespeare*, *W. Shakespeare*, *Wm. Shakespeare*, and *William Shakespeare*. In regard to Bacon's other pen-names, it is probably best to accept either the surname alone, or the full Christian name and surname together—nothing else. In the case of *Marlowe* I admit the spelling *Marloe* in addition, because this appears on the original title page of *Hero and Leander*. The results obtained, not only here but elsewhere, seem to justify these selections.

Proceeding now to an examination of those pages on which one or more italic words occur, we notice on the second page the italicised word *Audit*, which is an unusually clear direction ; for Bacon, with his punning propensity, is actually telling us to *add it!* This same pun occurs again

in Sonnet 126, and is also to be seen more than once in the 1623 Shakespeare Folio. The results of this addition are before the reader on the reproduction of this page here given.

10 This were to be new made when thou art ould,
10–20 And ſee thy blood warme when thou feel'ſt it could,

3

10 LOoke in thy glaſſe and tell the face thou veweſt,
10 Now is the time that face ſhould forme an other,
8 Whoſe freſh repaire if now thou not reneweſt,
8 Thou doo'ſt beguile the world, vnbleſſe ſome mother.
9 For where is ſhe ſo faire whoſe vn-eard wombe
6 Diſdaines the tillage of thy husbandry?
10 Or who is he ſo fond will be the tombe,
7 Of his ſelfe loue to ſtop poſterity?
9 Thou art thy mothers glaſſe and ſhe in thee
8 Calls backe the louely Aprill of her prime,
9 So thou through windowes of thine age ſhalt ſee,
7 Diſpight of wrinkles this thy goulden time.
8 But if thou liue remembred not to be,
8–117 Die ſingle and thine Image dies with thee.

4

6 VNthrifty loueline ſſe why doſt thou ſpend,
6 Vpon thy ſelfe thy beauties legacy?
7 Natures bequeſt giues nothing but doth lend,
9 And being franck ſhe lends to those are free:
7 Then beautious nigard why dooſt thou abuſe,
7 The bountious large ſſe giuen thee to giue?
6 Profitles vſerer why do oſt thou vſe
10 So great a ſumme of ſummes yet can'ſt not liue?
7 For hauing traffike with thy ſelfe alone,
9 Thou of thy ſelfe thy ſweet ſelfe doſt deceaue,
9 Then how when nature calls thee to be gone, I.W. I
5 What acceptable *Audit* can'ſt thou leaue? I
8 Thy vnuſ'd beauty muſt be tomb'd with thee,
7–103 Which vſed liues th'executor to be.

5

8 THoſe howers that with gentle worke did frame,
8 The louely gaze where euery eye doth dwell
8 Will play the tirants to the very ſame,
— 24 A

264

WHOLE PAGE

R.W. 264 = Bacon-Shakespeare (R)
—I.L. 5

259 = Shakespeare (K)

SONNET 4

R.W. 103 = Shakespeare (S)
—I.L. 5

98 = Greene (R)

ACROSTICS

SONNET 4

First letters of first words (K) = 282 = Francis Bacon
First letters of last words (S) = 129 = Francis Bacon Kt.
Ditto (R) = 221 = Francis Bacon Kt.
Last letters of last words (R) = 264 = Bacon-Shakespeare.

This series of acrostics is very telling.

Observe, too, how the number 264 occurs in two different species of signatures, as though to confirm the author's intention.

10 O carue not with thy howers my loues faire brow,
9 Nor draw noe lines there with thine antique pen,
7 Him in thy courſe vntainted doe allow,
6 For beauties patterne to ſucceding men.
9 Yet doe thy worſt ould Time diſpight thy wrong,
9–50 My loueſhall in my verſe euer liue young.

20

8 A Womans face with natures owne hand painted,
8 Haſte thou the Maſter Miſtris of my paſſion,
7 A womans gentle hart but not acquainted
8 With ſhifting change as is falſe womens faſhion,
10 An eye more bright then theirs, leſſe falſe in rowlng:
6 Gilding the obiect where-vpon it gazeth, I.W.
8 A man in hew all *Hews* in his controwling, I
8 Which ſteales mens eyes and womens ſoules amaſeth,
8 And for a woman wert thou firſt created,
9 Till nature asſhe wrought thee fell a dotinge,
7 And by addition me of thee defeated,
8 By adding one thing to my purpoſe nothing.
9 But ſinceſhe prickt thee out for womens pleaſure,
10–114 Mine be thy loue and thy loues vſe their treaſure.

21

10 SO is it not with me as with that Muſe,
8 Stird by a painted beauty to his verſe,
8 Who heauen it ſelfe for ornament doth vſe,
8 And euery faire with his faire doth reherſe,
6 Making a coopelment of proud compare
10 With Sunne and Moone, with earth and ſeas rich gems:
9 With Aprills firſt borne flowers and all things rare,
8 That heauens ayre in this huge rondure hems,
9 O let me true in loue but truly write,
9 And then beleeue me, my loue is as faire,
8 As any mothers childe, though not ſo bright
8 As thoſe gould candells fixt in heauens ayer.
9 Let them ſay more that like of heare-ſay well,
9–119 I will not prayſe that purpoſe not to ſell.

WHOLE PAGE

R.W. 283
+I.W. 1
284 = Francis Bacon Knight (R)

R.W. 283
—I.W. 1
282 = Francis Bacon (K)

R.W. 283
+I.L. 4
287 = Fra. Rosicrosse (K)

R.W. 283
—I.L. 4
279 = Edmund Spenser (K)

A particularly neat quartet of signatures.

SONNET 20

R.W. 114
—I.W. 1
113 = Puttenham (R)

SONNET 21

R.W. 119 = Fr. Bacon (R)

ACROSTIC

SONNET 20

Last letters of first words (K) = 370 = Bacon-Shakespeare.

The Arte of English Poesie must undoubtedly be assigned to Bacon. This treatise on the technique of poetry, published anonymously in 1589, was the most important work of its kind in Elizabethan times, and not until many years after its appearance was its authorship connected, by hearsay only, with a certain Puttenham, "one of her Maiesty's gentleman pensioners, as the Fame is"; this, in spite of the fact that no such name can be found on the records of Queen Elizabeth's pensioners. Francis Bacon, on the other hand, having been left comparatively unprovided for at the death of Sir Nicholas Bacon, was assisted financially at various times by the Queen, and also acted in the capacity of unofficial adviser to her Majesty. He might, therefore, quite properly be described as a "gentleman pensioner," if a covert reference were desired. In his scholarly work, *Bacon's Nova Resuscitatio* (London: Gay & Bird, 1905) Rev. Walter Begley discusses this problem very ably, not only disposing of the nebulous brothers Puttenham, but giving cogent reasons for identifying Francis Bacon as the true author. The little that is known of these brothers almost precludes the possibility of any one of the three being responsible for so remarkable a work as *The Arte of English Poesie*.

As it is impossible to say whether Bacon deliberately encouraged the rumour of Puttenham's authorship, we cannot be sure that these cipher signatures are planned. But I believe so.

8 Since euery one, hath euery one, one ſhade,
8 And you but one, can euery ſhaddow lend:
4 Deſcribe *Adonis* and the counterfet, 1
5 Is poorely immitated after you,
7 On *Hellens* cheeke all art of beautie ſet; 1
7 And you in *Grecian* tires are painted new: 1
9 Speake of the ſpring, and foyzon of the yeare, —
8 The one doth ſhaddow of your beautie ſhow, 3
7 The other as your bountie doth appeare,
8 And you in euery bleſſed ſhape we know.
8 In all externall grace you haue ſome part,
9–88 But you like none, none you for conſtant heart.

54

8 O H how much more doth beautie beautious ſeeme,
8 By that ſweet ornament which truth doth giue,
9 The Roſe lookes faire, but fairer we it deeme
9 For that ſweet odor, which doth in it liue:
9 The Canker bloomes haue full as deepe a die,
7 As the perfumed tincture of the Roſes,
8 Hang on ſuch thornes, and play as wantonly,
7 When ſommers breath their masked buds diſcloſes;
8 But for their virtue only is their ſhow,
6 They liue vnwoo'd, and vnreſpected fade,
8 Die to themſelues. Sweet Roſes doe not ſo,
8 Of their ſweet deathes, are ſweeteſt odors made:
8 And ſo of you, beautious and louely youth,
9–112 When that ſhall vade, by verſe diſtils your truth.

55

6 N Ot marble, nor the guilded monument,
7 Of Princes shall out-liue this powrefull rime,
9 But you ſhall ſhine more bright in theſe contents
7 Then vnſwept ſtone, besmeer'd with ſluttiſh time.
5 When waſtefull warre ſhall *Statues* ouer-turne, 1
8 And broiles roote out the worke of maſonry,
9 Nor *Mars* his ſword, nor warres quick fire ſhall burne; 1
6–57 The liuing record of your memory.

Gainſt —

It is clear that if Bacon had confined himself to giving signatures only on the whole page and on the sonnet ear-marked by an italic word, the variety would have been needlessly restricted to two groups of signatures occurring within certain numerical limits. Accordingly, I believe he sometimes takes a well-defined section of a page instead. This page is apparently an instance, since the totals of 257, 5, and 31 appear to yield nothing.

SONNETS 53 and 54

R.W. 88 = Bright (R)
and 112 = Puttenham (S)

200 = Francis Bacon (R)

SONNET 53

R.W. 88
+I.W. 3

91 = Spenser (S)

R.W. 88
—I.W. 3

85 = Fr. Bacon Kt. (S)

R.W. 88
—I.L. 20

68 = F. Bacon Kt. (S)

SONNET 54

R.W. 112 = Puttenham (S)

SONNET 55

R.W. 57
+I.L. 11

68 = F. Bacon Kt. (S)

ACROSTICS

SONNET 53

Last letters of *first* words (S) = 100 = Francis Bacon
Ditto. (R) = 200 = Francis Bacon.
Last letters of *last* words (K) = 282 = Francis Bacon.

SONNET 55

First letters of *first* words (R) = 98 = Greene
First letters of *last* words (S) = 91 = Spenser
Ditto (K) = 143 = F. Bacon and Spenser
Last letters of *first* words (S) = 96 = George Peele
Last letters of *last* words (S) = 103 = Shakespeare.

A truly remarkable series of acrostics from only two sonnets.

Were it not ſinfull then ſtriuing to mend,
To marre the ſubiect that before was well,
For to no other paſſe my verſes tend,
Then of your graces and your gifts to tell.
And more, much more then in my verſe can ſit,
Your owne glaſſe ſhowes you, when you looke in it.

104

TO me faire friend you neuer can be old,
For as you were when firſt your eye I eyde,
Such seemes your beautie ſtill: Three Winters colde,
Haue from the forreſts ſhooke three ſummers pride, 1.w.
Three beautious ſprings to yellow *Autumne* turn'd, 1
In proceſſe of the ſeasons haue I ſeene,
Three Aprill perfumes in three hot Iunes burn'd,
Since firſt I ſaw you freſh which yet are greene,
Ah yet doth beauty like a Dyall hand,
Steale from his figure, and no pace perceiu'd,
So your ſweete hew, which me thinkes ſtill doth ſtand,
Hath motion, and mine eye may be deceaued.
For feare of which, heare this thou age vnbred,
Ere you were borne was beauties ſummer dead,

105

LEt not my loue be cal'd Idolatrie,
Nor my beloued as an Idoll ſhow,
Since all alike my ſongs and praiſes be
To one, of one, ſtill ſuch, and euer ſo,
Kinde is my loue to day, to morrow kinde,
Still conſtant in a wondrous excellence,
Therefore my verſe to conſtancie confin'de,
One thing expreſſing, leaues out difference,
Faire, kinde, and true, is all my argument,
Faire, kinde and true, varrying to other words,
And in this change is my inuention ſpent,
Three theams in one, which wondrous ſcope affords.
Faire, kinde, and true, haue often liu'd alone.
Which three till now, neuer kept ſeate in one.

— 107 Wh

278

WHOLE PAGE

R.W. 278 = George Peele (K)
+I.W. 1

279 = Edmund Spenser (K)

R.W. 278
—I.L. 7

271 = Francis Tudor (K)

SONNET 104

R.W. 118
+I.W. 1

119 = Fr. Bacon (R)

R.W. 118
—I.L. 7

111 = Bacon (K)

ACROSTICS

SONNET 104

Last letters of first words (S) = 129 = Francis Bacon Kt.
Ditto (R) = 221 = Francis Bacon Kt.

A most excellent page, giving clear evidence of careful design.

9 Then giue me welcome next my heauen the beſt
9 Euen to thy pure and moſt moſt louing breſt.

111

9 O For my ſake doe you wiſh fortune chide,
7 The guiltie goddeſſe of my harmfull deeds,
8 That did not better for my life prouide,
7 Then publick meanes which publick manners breeds.
9 Thence comes it that my name receiues a brand,
7 And almoſt thence my nature is ſubdu'd
9 To what it workes in, like the Dyers hand,
8 Pitty me then, and wiſh I were renu'de,
8 Whilſt like a willing pacient I will drinke,
7 Potions of Eyſell gainſt my ſtrong infection,
7 No bitterneſſe that I will bitter thinke,
6 Nor double pennance to correct correction.
9 Pittie me then deare friend, and I aſſure yee,
9–128 Euen that your pittie is enough to cure mee.

112

8 Y Our loue and pittie doth th'impreſſion fill,
7 Which vulgar ſcandall ſtampt vpon my brow,
10 For what care I who calles me well or ill,
8 So you ore-greene my bad, my good alow?
10 You are my All the world, and I muſt ſtriue,
9 To know my ſhames and praiſes from your tounge,
9 None elſe to me, nor I to none aliue,
9 That my ſteel'd ſence or changes right or wrong, I.W.1
7 In ſo profound *Abiſme* I throw all care 1
7 Of others voyces, that my Adders ſence,
7 To cryttick and to flatterer ſtopped are:
8 Marke how with my neglect I doe diſpence.
8 You are ſo ſtrongly in my purpoſe bred,
10–117 That all the world beſides me thinkes y'are dead.

113

10 S Ince I left you, mine eye is in my minde,
8 And that which gouernes me to goe about,
8 Doth part his function, and is partly blind,

— 26 Seemes

271

WHOLE PAGE

R.W. 271 = Francis Tudor (K)

LOWER SECTION

R.W. 117
and 26

143 = F. Bacon (K) and Spenser (K)
+I.L. 6

149 = Edmund Spenser (S)

SONNET 112

R.W. 117
—I.L. 6

111 = Bacon (K)

ACROSTICS

SONNET 112

Last letters of first words (R) = 159 = Francis Tudor
Last letters of last words (R) = 236 = Christopher Marlowe

Notice how the Tudor signature is confirmed by the acrostic.

In order not to weary the reader with too many figures, I will now give a few more pages of these signatures, taking those which present some feature of interest, relegating the remainder to Appendix B, where they will be available for those who wish to investigate the matter thoroughly.

Seemes ſeeing, but effectually is out:
For it no forme deliuers to the heart
Of bird, of flowre, or ſhape which it doth lack,
Of his quick obiects hath the minde no part,
Nor his owne viſion houlds what it doth catch:
For if it ſee the rud'ſt or gentleſt ſight,
The moſt ſweet-fauor or deformedſt creature,
The mountaine, or the ſea, the day, or night:
The Croe, or Doue, it ſhapes them to your feature.
Incapable of more repleat, with you,
My moſt true minde thus maketh mine vntrue.

114

OR whether doth my minde being crown'd with you
Drinke vp the monarks plague this flattery?
Or whether ſhall I ſay mine eie ſaith true,
And that your loue taught it this *Alcumie?*
To make of monſters, and things indigeſt,
Such cherubines as your ſweet ſelfe reſemble,
Creating euery bad a perfect beſt
As faſt as obiects to his beames aſſemble:
Oh tis the firſt, tis flatry in my ſeeing,
And my great minde moſt kingly drinkes it vp,
Mine eie well knowes what with his guſt is greeing,
And to his pallat doth prepare the cup.
If it be poiſon'd, tis the leſſer ſinne,
That mine eye loues it and doth firſt beginne.

115

THoſe lines that I before haue writ doe lie,
Euen thoſe that ſaid I could not loue you deerer,
Yet then my iudgement knew no reaſon why,
My moſt full flame ſhould afterwards burne cleerer.
But reckening time, whoſe milliond accidents
Creepe in twixt vowes, and change decrees of Kings,
Tan ſacred beautie, blunt theſharp'ſt intents,
Diuert ſtrong mindes to th' courſe of altring things:
Alas why fearing of times tiranie,

WHOLE PAGE

R.W. 275
+I.L. 7

282 = Francis Bacon (K)

SONNET 114

R.W. 113 = Puttenham (R)
—I.W. 1

112 = Puttenham (S)

ACROSTICS

SONNET 114

Last letters of first words (S) = 136 = Bacon-Shakespeare
Ditto (K) = 370 = Bacon-Shakespeare

Not much in quantity, but the quality is good.

6 Or layd great baſes for eternity,
8 Which proues more ſhort then waſt or ruining?
9 Haue I not ſeene dwellers on forme and fauor
9 Loſe all, and more by paying too much rent
6 For compound ſweet; Forgoing ſimple ſauor,
6 Pittifull thriuors in their gazing ſpent.
8 Noe, let me be obſequious in thy heart,
8 And take thou my oblacion, poore but free,
9 Which is not mixt with ſeconds, knows no art,
7 But mutuall render, onely me for thee. I.W. I.
6 Hence, thou ſubbornd *Informer*, a trew ſoule 1
8–90 When moſt impeacht, ſtands leaſt in thy controule.

126 All L.

9 O Thou my louely Boy who in thy power, 28
8 Doeſt hould times ficke glaſſe, his ſickle, hower; 41
8 Who haſt by wayning growne, and therein ſhou'ſt, 38
8 Thy louers withering, as thy ſweet ſelfe grow'ſt. 39
6 If Nature (ſoueraine miſteres ouer wrack) 34
9 As thou goeſt onwards ſtill will plucke thee backe, 42
9 She keepes thee to this purpoſe, that her skill. 38
7 May time diſgrace, and wretched mynuit kill. 36
9 Yet feare her O thou minnion of her pleaſure, 36
9 She may detaine, but not ſtill keepe her treſure! 39
6 Her *Audite* (though delayd) anſwer'd muſt be, 34
6–94 And her *Quietus* is to render thee. 27 1
( ) ——
( ) 432

127

9 IN the ould age blacke was not counted faire,
9 Or if it weare it bore not beauties name:
7 But now is blacke beauties ſucceſſiue heire,
7 And Beautie ſlanderd with a baſtard ſhame,
9 For ſince each hand hath put on Natures power,
8 Fairing the foule with Arts faulſe borrow'd face,
8 Sweet beauty hath no name no holy boure,
8–65 But is prophan'd, if not liues in diſgrace.

Although this page as a whole gives no signature, it divides itself very neatly into the following groups, counting from the top: 52, 39, 33, 56, 39, 33. 52 = Greene, 39 = F. Bacon, 33 = Bacon, 56 = Fr. Bacon, all in simple cipher. This is taking all words, including italics. Probably therefore these signatures are intended instead of a page total.

SONNET 125

R.W.	90	= Marloe (R)	R.W.	90	
+I.W.	1		+I.L.	9	
	91	= Spenser (S)		98	= Greene (R)

SONNET 126

Naturally this has puzzled the critics; for although twelve line sonnets sometimes occur in similar circumstances, the ostentatious brackets enclosing two empty spaces are a challenge. The usual way out of such difficulties is merely to ejaculate, "Ignorant publisher," or "Careless printer." But if only the critics would bring a little of their ingenuity to bear on the subject of ciphers, instead of studiously ignoring it, some of their problems might very quickly be solved. In this case Bacon very kindly gives us hints. First there is the italicised word "*Informer*," telling us that he is about to inform us of something. Then, as in Sonnet 4, the word "*Audite*" again turns up as an instruction to *add it*. Next, I take the word "*Quietus*" to mean that the last two lines are intentionally quiet, silent, or blank, even though this word had a technical legal sense. And finally, those very obtrusive brackets are surely a hint that brackets are in some way connected with a hidden signature. So again we count letters as well as words, and behold the riddle is laid bare.

All L.	432				
— Words in brackets	6				
	426	= Francis Bacon Knight(K) (As in Sonnet 1, the large initial letter is omitted from the count)			

also

R.W.	94	= Marlowe (R)	R.W.	94	
+I.W.	2		—I.W.	2	
	96	= George Peele (S)		92	= Bacon (R)

ACROSTICS

SONNET 125

First letters of first words	(S)	= 141	=	Francis Tudor
Ditto	(R)	= 159	=	Francis Tudor
First letters of last words	(S)	= 136	=	Bacon-Shakespeare and Wm. Shakespeare.
Ditto	(K)	= 292	=	Wm. Shakespeare
Last letters of last words	(R)	= 140	=	Fr. Bacon Kt.

SONNET 126

First letters of first words	(K)	= 278	=	George Peele
Last letters of first words	(K)	= 271	=	Francis Tudor
Last letters of last words	(S)	= 129	=	Francis Bacon Kt.
Ditto	(K)	= 259	=	Shakespeare.

Altogether a most remarkable chain of evidence on one single page.

9 And ſue a friend, came debter for my ſake,
8 So him I looſe through my vnkinde abuſe.
10 Him haue I loſt, thou haſt both him and me,
10–37 He paies the whole, and yet am I not free.

135

8 WHo euer hath her wiſh, thou haſt thy *Will*, 1
6 And *Will* too boote, and *Will* in ouer-plus, 2
9 More then enough am I that vexe thee ſtill,
7 To thy ſweet will making addition thus,
8 Wilt thou whoſe will is large and ſpatious,
9 Not once vouchſafe to hide my will in thine,
7 Shall will in others ſeeme right gracious,
8 And in my will no faire acceptance ſhine:
8 The ſea all water, yet receiues raine ſtill,
7 And in aboundance addeth to his ſtore,
8 So thou beeing rich in *Will* adde to thy *Will*, 2
9 One will of mine to make thy large *Will* more. 1
7 Let no vnkinde, no faire beſeechers kill
9–110 Thinke all but one, and me in that one *Will*. 1

136

10 IF thy ſoule check thee that I come ſo neere, 7 2
9 Sweare to thy blinde ſoule that I was thy *Will*, 1
8 And will thy ſoule knowes is admitted there,
8 Thus farre for loue, my loue-ſute ſweet fullfill.
7 *Will*, will fulfill the treaſures of thy loue, 1
10 I fill it full with wils, and my will one,
9 In things of great receit with eaſe we prooue,
7 Among a number one is reckon'd none.
8 Then in the number let me paſſe vntold,
9 Though in thy ſtores account I one muſt be,
9 For nothing hold me ſo it pleaſe thee hold,
8 That nothing me, a ſome-thing ſweet to thee.
10 Make but my name thy loue, and loue that ſtill,
9–121 And then thou loueſt me for my name is *Will*. 1

137

10 10 THou blinde foole loue, what dooſt thou to mine eyes,
— I That — —
278 3 1

These are the well-known " Will " sonnets. Incidentally, I remark that it is not reasonable to adduce the last line of Sonnet 136 as evidence for Shakspere's authorship, since by 1609 the public had already confused Will Shakspere with William Shake-speare. Hence Bacon, who *was* the latter, would be quite justified in referring to himself *here* as " Will "—if that be the meaning of the phrase.

Since the total of this page gives nothing but R.W. 278 = George Peele (K); and as, moreover, there is manifestly an elaborate scheme of word play spread all over it, further search seems necessary. At any rate we have:

SONNET 135

R.W.	110		R.W.	110	
+I.L.	28		—I.W.	7	
	138	= Prince of Wales (S)		103	= Shakespeare (S)

SONNET 136

R.W.	121		R.W.	121	
+I.L.	12		+I.W.	3	
	133	= Marlowe (K)		124	= W. Shakespeare (S)

Are we intended also to take the two obvious divisions of the entire page? If so, the upper section gives:

R.W.	37				
and	110				
	147		R.W.	147	
—I.L.	28		—I.W.	7	
	119	= Fr. Bacon (R)		140	= Fr. Bacon Kt. (R)

and the lower section:

R.W.	121				
and	10				
	131		R.W.	131	
+I.L.	12		—I.L.	12	
	143	= F. Bacon (K) and Spenser (K)		119	= Fr. Bacon (R)

ACROSTICS:

SONNET 136

First letters of last words (K) = 278 = George Peele.

I believe there are further mysteries on this page, but so far they have eluded my search.

154 R.L.

7 THe little Loue-God lying once a ſleepe, 31
8 Laid by his ſide his heart inflaming brand, 35
9 Whilſt many Nymphes that vou'd chaſt life to keep, 40
8 Came tripping by, but in her maiden hand, 32–1
7 The fayreſt votary tooke vp that fire, 31
8 Which many Legions of true hearts had warm'd, 36–6
7 And ſo the Generall of hot deſire, 27
7 Was ſleeping by a Virgin hand diſarm'd. 31
9 This brand ſhe quenched in a coole Well by, 34
7 Which from loues fire tooke heat perpetuall, 37–1
6 Growing a bath and healthfull remedy, 31
8 For men diſeaſd, but I my Miſtriſſe thrall, 34
10 Came there for cure and this by that I proue, 35
8 Loues fire heates water, water cooles not loue. 38–1

I

FINIS

III

K A

There are no italicised words here, but we always expect to find some evidence on the last page, even though it is not the final page of the volume. Hence there is little doubt that we are meant to take the heading, which is sometimes done, and the word " Finis," which is frequently done, in order to produce the familiar 111 = Bacon (K) once more. I suggest that purpose is also shown by the grouping of this sonnet into the four totals of letters shown opposite, since they represent :

138 = Prince of Wales (S)
67 = Francis (S)
129 = Francis Bacon Kt. (S)
138 = Prince of Wales (S)

As the Rosicrucian seal would almost certainly be found at the end of this collection of sonnets, one looks for it carefully. In this instance it is very neatly hidden ; and had not the ingenuity of Mr. Frank Woodward solved this little puzzle some years ago, I might perhaps have missed it. He points to the enormous capital K on this page, instead of the usual small capital letters on other sheets throughout the book. It is the same size as the catch-word A and the word FINIS. This is the kind of hint which Bacon often gives, and so we conclude that these two letters K and A are to be utilised for constructing a signature. The method is to give each of the letters in the word " Sonnets " its value in K cipher, thus :

S	18
O	14
N	13
N	13
E	31
T	19
S	18
	126
Sonnet No.	154
FINIS	5
K and A	2
	287 = Fra. Rosicrosse (K)

And, as though to confirm this interpretation, the same plan appears to be adopted a second time, thus :

F	32
I	35
N	13
I	35
S	18
	133
Sonnet No.	154
	287 = Fra. Rosicrosse (K)

An exceptionally clever and amusing way of hiding these signatures.

ACROSTIC

SONNET 154

Last letters of first words (S) = 141 = Francis Tudor
Last letters of last words (S) = 124 = W. Shakespeare

A fitting termination to the series, since it is just these two signatures which enshrine the two great secrets of Francis Bacon's life.

Before closing this chapter, reference must be made to two examples of the ordinary acrostic, as distinct from the numerical variety which we have so far been considering. In the ninth and tenth lines of Sonnet 14, the device is sufficiently apparent, but for the sake of greater clearness I have underlined the letters.

"But from thine eies my knowledge I deriue
And constant stars in them I read such art."

It is, of course, common to find two consecutive lines commencing with B and A respectively ; and one may sometimes see the prefix *con* as well. But when we have *fr*, *B*, *A*, *con* in regular sequence on the first two words of these lines, forming such a compact little acrostic, the chances of all this occurring by accident become very remote, and intention is almost certainly indicated. In the above example I think all doubt is set at rest by the fact that "constant" (S) = 100 = Francis Bacon (S).

Now take another instance in Sonnet 73. Here the eleventh and twelfth lines are :—

"As the death bed, whereon it must expire
Consum'd with that which it was nurrisht by."

This is quite a usual formation ; the first and last words of each line being utilized instead of the two first in each case. One must bear in mind that *Beacon* would be pronounced the same as *Bacon* in Elizabethan and Jacobean times ; so that the acrostic is a perfectly good signature. In this case, too, there seems no doubt as to intention, since "consum'd"

(S) = 84 = Spenser (R)
(R) = 91 = Spenser (S)
(K) = 136 = Bacon-Shakespeare
and Wm. Shakes-peare (S).

even though these are non-symmetrical as regards cipher codes.

"... it certainly suggests the exceeding probability that the universal genius, enthroned by Ben Jonson on the summit of Parnassus, and the author of the Plays were one and the same person."

PROFESSOR S. E. BENGOUGH.

CHAPTER VI

THE TEXT OF THE 1609 QUARTO

IN preparing this little book, I have addressed myself deliberately to a single definite task, namely to show that the 1609 Quarto contains full and satisfactory cipher evidence of Francis Bacon's authorship. Therefore, in order not to obscure this main argument, and also to keep the book within reasonable proportions, I have been compelled to abstain from discussing a number of interesting and even important collateral themes. There is one question, however, which bears directly on my proposition, and that is the text of this Quarto. Here there are two points for consideration ; firstly as to its authenticity or verbal correctness, and secondly as to the proper sequence of the various sonnets or groups of sonnets.

By way of summarising the attitude of scholars on the first of these points I cannot do better than quote a passage from one of the latest and most complete surveys of the subject, namely, *The Sonnets of Shakespeare : from the Quarto of* 1609, *with Variorum Readings and Commentary*, edited by Raymond Macdonald Alden (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1916). On p. 419 we read : " In his note on the text of the Sonnets as issued in the *Stratford Town Shakespeare* (1907) Bullen observes : ' While I wholly dissent from Mr. Wyndham's view that Shakespeare authorized and superintended the publication, I cannot agree with Canon Beeching that the 1609 Sonnets is exceptionally ill-printed. Errors there are, but they are generally of trifling import ' . . . He adds that a number of the errors in Lee's list may be regarded as fairly normal variants of spelling. Beyond these arguments there does not seem much prospect of advancing. In general it may be said with assurance that Wyndham's view of the

quarto text has not proved tenable, and that most critics would stand, on the whole, with Beeching and Lee." From what has been argued in the present book, it will be clear to the reader that Francis Bacon must of necessity have supervised with the greatest care the title page, dedication, first and last pages, and indeed everything which could bear on cipher material. I have examined Sir Sidney Lee's list of errors, and only in a single instance could these have any effect on the cipher signatures we have been considering. This is in Sonnet 112, where the last line reads :

" That all the world besides me thinkes y'are dead."

It has been proposed to alter this to " methinks are dead," thus making two words less in the whole count.

While it is quite possible that Bacon did not correct some of what seem to be obvious misprints, yet one has learned to be so cautious of making such corrections, that I am not disposed to treat this one instance as an exception. Moreover, it is by no means impossible that some, or even all, of these apparent misprints and curious spellings may be purposely arranged for the requirements of some as yet undiscovered cipher system, other than any which we have been discussing here. We may also bear in mind Staunton's view, quoted by Mr. Alden (*op cit.*, p. 417) : " At the same time they do not appear to have been sent to press without examination by a qualified person. The metrical arrangement is remarkably free from error."

But there is another point of far greater interest. It is well known that many pairs of sonnets, separated in the 1609 Quarto, seem to cohere naturally by virtue of their close similarity of thought and phraseology ; while frequent attempts have been made to indicate some chronological sequence either for the whole series or for groups classified in various ways. The reason for these speculations is, of course, that the orthodox view represents Thorpe as the piratical publisher of a miscellany of manuscript sonnets, filched by the mysterious " Mr. W. H." from no one knows where, and printed with no regard either to order of composition or that artistic sequence which the true author would have desired. Although I am not able to accept this

view, yet the question of the order in which the sonnets are printed has a distinct bearing on the proposition which I am engaged in establishing, besides being a matter of general interest. In this connection, one of the most attractive theories is that propounded by Sir Denys Bray.[1] He appears to be almost the only writer who has a definite scheme applicable to the whole body of the Sonnets. After referring to the various critics who have each advanced theories on the subject, Sir Denys says (p. 2) : " My own claim is at once greater and more humble. It is no new theory that I have to set forth. Only one hard fact :—the mechanical coupling of sonnet to sonnet by rhyme-link. Nor any brilliant arrangement of my own. Simply Shakespeare's." He then proceeds to group the entire series into categories according to subject-matter and to show how the connecting rhyme-link welds each of these into an unbroken chain. As to whether the original sequence was broken by accident or design, Sir Denys admits that this is a puzzling question, but he says (p. 43) : " And if of design, is there any need to look beyond Shakespeare himself? The motive seems clear enough, at any rate to those of us who have always looked upon the Sonnets as the passionate expression of a storm-swept period in Shakespeare's life. For us there is no difficulty in regarding the disorderly order of the Quarto as a veil of Shakespeare's own making, to hide or at least to shield his secrets from an 'ill-wresting world.' "

A very interesting theory this, and one which merits close attention. To my own mind the argument carries much weight, and one feels that it might at least be accepted provisionally. I should, of course, substitute the name Bacon for the name Shakespeare, simply because " a storm-swept period " such as many of the sonnets depict fits with such accuracy into the known facts of Francis Bacon's life history, and because these intensely autobiographical outpourings of a profound and cultured mind are so entirely characteristic of *him* ; whereas by no conceivable twisting can they be made to represent Will Shaksper, " the Stratford rustic," as eminent critics have truthfully called him.

[1] *The Original Order of Shakespeare's Sonnets.* London, Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1925.

A still more recent writer, Mr. Randall Davies, has put forward some very suggestive ideas, partially on Baconian lines.[1] His notes are entirely confined to Sonnets 1-126, and he adopts Southampton as the hero of this series ; but, with more reason than is shown by those who vainly imagine " the Stratford rustic " to have been a personal friend of this young nobleman, he suggests as a working hypothesis that these sonnets were addressed to Southampton by someone who was in truth an intimate friend at one time, namely Francis Bacon. And he produces interesting parallels, for example between the subject matter of Sonnet 107, together with those closely following it, and Bacon's *Apology*, published in 1604. Here, again, is a more natural explanation of that " storm-swept period "—the deaths of Lady Anne Bacon and Anthony Bacon, and the tragedy of Essex, for which Francis has, by some writers, been so unjustly and even maliciously censured. When all the facts of that tragedy are duly weighed, it will be seen that Spedding was right in saying that he could not find fault with Bacon for the part he was *compelled* to take in that unhappy affair. Mr. Davies also makes some suggestions as to the grouping of sonnets, but not, apparently, on any one definite principle. Altogether an interesting contribution to this difficult subject.

It may now be asked how all this affects the main argument here put forward. As I understand the matter, very little. Still, that little must be considered.

We cannot possibly say whether Bacon deliberately planned marginal acrostics at the time of writing any of these sonnets—that is to say, after completing them, for it would not be done while the sonnet was actually in process of creation, but by slight subsequent modification, so I imagine—or whether he designed most of them when publishing the 1609 Quarto. In some cases there seems no doubt that the latter course was adopted ; e.g., the very strong examples in Sonnets 53 and 125 are formed in each case from the last twelve lines of the sonnet and in Sonnet 2 from the first twelve lines ; i.e., the printing of the pages must have been arranged in order to achieve these results ;

[1] *Notes upon some of Shakespeare's Sonnets.* Kensington, The Cayme Press, 1927.

unless, indeed, the sonnets themselves were revised for the purpose. We have no means of knowing all this. But with regard to the numerical signatures produced by the interplay of roman and italic types, *some* results could undoubtedly have been attained, whatever the sequence of the sonnets, merely by varying the number and incidence of italicized words. Probably, however, the order chosen did facilitate the work to some extent. Also, the book might have been printed so as to exhibit exactly two or exactly three sonnets on a page, instead of about two and a half; in fact one would almost have expected this. I think the paging was intentionally contrived as we have it in order to give slightly more freedom and variety in the construction of these signatures. Very possibly, too, Bacon thought that the presence of so *few* italic words would be a clearer hint to future decipherers than if they had been more plentiful. And again, it is not unreasonable to suggest that one reason for displacing the original order was for the very purpose of making us think why he did it ! And having begun to think, he might hope that we should then investigate the matter thoroughly and eventually discover his various secrets. For these and similar reasons I should be disposed to adopt the prevalent view that the original sequence has been altered ; but deliberately altered by the author and not accidentally confused by a piratical publisher.

Finally, we must not forget that the seal of the Rosicrucian Fraternity, besides appearing twice in the Dedication, is embedded in the first page of text and again, in duplicate, on the last page. This invests the whole collection with authority and makes it almost certain that errors, if any, are not of serious import.

"I can't help anticipating that, some of these days, Bacon letters or other papers will turn up, interpretive of his, at present, dark phrase to Sir John Davies, of 'Your concealed poet.' We have noble contemporary poetry, unhappily anonymous, and I shall not be surprised to find Bacon the concealed singer of some of it."

DR. ALEXANDER B. GROSART.

CHAPTER VII

"A LOVERS COMPLAINT"

THIS little poem was bound up with the collection of *Shake-speares Sonnets* in the original edition of 1609, and, so far as we know, does not appear anywhere else. It is, of course, only a slight composition, somewhat in the conventional vein of the times, and with many of the faults of that style. I will not here speculate as to why Bacon chose this particular poem to accompany the Sonnets, and therefore accept the fact without comment.

From the standpoint of our present inquiry, the first page ought to bear indications of his authorship, and the last one even more so, since it forms the concluding page of the volume.

This first page will now be reproduced, with the various signatures to be found on it.

A Louers complaint.

BY

WILLIAM SHAKE-SPEARE.

R.W.

8 FRom off a hill whoſe concaue wombe reworded,
7 A plaintfull ſtory from a ſiſtring vale
8 My ſpirrits t'attend this doble voyce accorded,
10 And downe I laid to liſt the ſad tun'd tale,
8 Ere long eſpied a fickle maid full pale
7 Tearing of papers breaking rings a twaine,
8 Storming her world with ſorrowes, wind and raine.
—56

Vpon her head a plattid hiue of ſtraw,
Which fortified her viſsage from the Sunne,
Whereon the thought might thinke ſometime it ſaw
The carkas of a beauty ſpent and donne,
Time had not ſithed all that youth begun,
Nor youth all quit, but ſpight of heauens fell rage,
Some beauty peept, through lettice of ſear'd age.

Oft did ſhe heaue her Napkin to her eyne,
Which on it had conceited charecters:
Laundring the ſilken figures in the brine,
That ſeaſoned woe had pelleted in teares,
And often reading what contents it beares:
As often ſhriking vndiſtinguiſht wo,
In clamours of all ſize both high and low,

Some-times her leueld eyes their carriage ride,
As they did battry to the ſpheres intend:
Sometime diuerted their poore balls are tide,
To th'orbed earth; ſometimes they do extend,
Their view right on, anon their gaſes lend,

To

Reference has already been made to the FR at the commencement of Sonnet 1 in this volume, and here we see the same device in a different guise. There is no capital B under the F, but good evidence is given in the first line, as follows :

" From off a hill whose concave wombe reworded "

As already remarked, in the sixteenth century *beacon* would be pronounced like *Bacon*; so that this first line gives us *Fr. Beacon*, i.e., *Fr. Bacon.* Such little pleasantries are not confined to Francis Bacon by any means. Note again the employment of the word " From " which in R = 51 = Tudor.

STANZA I

R.W. 56 = Fr. Bacon (S)

ACROSTICS

STANZA I

First letters of first words	(S)	=	62	= Bright
Ditto	(K)	=	166	= Bright
Ditto	(R)	=	113	= Puttenham
Last letters of first words	(K)	=	189	= Fr. Bacon Kt.
Last letters of last words	(S)	=	33	= Bacon

8 The accident which brought me to her eie,
7 Vpon the moment did her force ſubdewe,
8 36 And now ſhe would the caged cloiſter flie:
6 Religious loue put out religions eye:
8 Not to be tempted would ſhe be enur'd,
7 And now to tempt all liberty procure.
— 44

9 How mightie then you are, Oh heare me tell,
7 The broken boſoms that to me belong,
8 Haue emptied all their fountaines in my well:
8 37 And mine I powre your Ocean all amonge:
10 I ſtrong ore them and you ore me being ſtrong,
7 Muſt for your victorie vs all congeſt,
8 As compound loue to phiſick your cold breſt.
— 57

9 My parts had powre to charme a ſacred Sunne,
6 Who diſciplin'd I dieted in grace,
8 Beleeu'd her eies, when they t' aſſsaile begun,
6 38 All vowes and conſecrations giuing place:
8 — O moſt potentiall loue, vowe, bond, nor ſpace
8 111 In thee hath neither ſting, knot, nor confine
10 55 For thou art all and all things els are thine.
156

7 When thou impreſſeſt what are precepts worth
7 Of ſtale example? when thou wilt inflame,
6 How coldly thoſe impediments ſtand forth
8 39 Of wealth of filliall feare, lawe, kindred fame, (shame
10 Loues armes are peace, gainſt rule, gainſt ſence, gainſt
8 And ſweetens in the ſuffring pangues it beares, I.W. I
7 The *Alloes* of all forces, ſhockes and feares. I
— 53

9 Now all theſe hearts that doe on mine depend,
8 Feeling it breake, with bleeding groanes they pine,
7 40 And ſupplicant their ſighes to you extend
9 To leaue the battrie that you make gainſt mine,
7 Lending ſoft audience, to my ſweet deſigne,
— 40 And
249

Here, a count of the whole page gives numbers which do not suggest anything, to myself at least. But as there is an italicised word, one feels sure that signatures are hidden somewhere.

I notice first that the word "*Alloes*," when decoded, represents *Marloe* in all three ciphers. This is probably a hint. Next, it occurs in the 39th stanza ; and 39 = F. Bacon (S). Has the stanza number any connection with the concealed signatures, seeing that the Sonnet number 154 was so used ? Stanza numbers 36, 37, 38, total 111 = Bacon (K), which suggests taking the page in two sections divided at that point. This seems a reasonable proceeding, and on that basis we have :

UPPER SECTION

R.W. 156 = Greene (K)

LOWER SECTION

R.W. 93
—I.W. 1
92 = Bacon (R)

STANZA 39

R.W. 53
—I.W. 1
52 = Greene (S)

Possibly also, Stanza No. 39
—I.L. 6
33 = Bacon (S) may be intended.

ACROSTICS

STANZA 39

First letters of last words (S) = 68 = F. Bacon Kt.
Last letters of last words (S) = 67 = Francis
Ditto (R) = 108 = Francis

8 And credent ſoule, to that ſtrong bonded oth,
7 That ſhall preferre and vndertake my troth.

8 This ſaid, his watrie eies he did diſmount,
9 Whoſe ſightes till then were leaueld on my face,
8 Each cheeke a riuer running from a fount,
7 With bryniſh currant downe-ward flowed a pace:
9—56 Oh how the channell to the ſtreame gaue grace!
8 Who glaz'd with Chriſtall gate the glowing Roſes,
8 That flame through water which their hew incloſes,

8 Oh father, what a hell of witch-craft lies,
8 In the small orb of one perticular teare?
7—39 But with the invndation of the eies:
8 What rocky heart to water will not weare?
9 What breſt ſo cold that is not warmed heare,
7 Or cleft effect, cold modeſty hot wrath:
8 Both fire from hence, and chill extincture hath.

9 For loe his paſſion but an art of craft,
7 Euen there reſolu'd my reaſon into teares,
8—56 There my white ſtole of chaſtity I daft,
8 Shooke off my ſober gardes, and ciuill feares,
8 Appeare to him as he to me appeares:
8 All melting, though our drops this diffrence bore,
8 His poiſon'd me, and mine did him reſtore,

7—39 In him a plenitude of ſubtle matter,
7 Applied to Cautills, all ſtraing formes receiues,
7 Of burning bluſhes, or of weeping water,
8 Or ſounding paleneſſe: and he takes and leaues,
7 In eithers aptneſſe as it beſt deceiues:
9 To bluſh at ſpeeches ranck, to weepe at woes
9 Or to turne white and ſound at tragick ſhowes.

9—56 That not a heart which in his leuell came,

Concealed signatures are sometimes found on the last page but one, as well as the last page, even when there is no special hint calling attention to them. Therefore we examine this page in any case, and find the following :

The total does not suggest anything, and we have no italic word. But, as will be seen, the page is composed of a series of Bacon signatures from top to bottom with no gaps.

39 = F. Bacon (S)
56 = Fr. Bacon (S)

It is also worth remarking that the last line on the page contains 33 letters = Bacon (S). One would not have taken notice of this, but for the fact that in this poem there are five pages on which a single line of a stanza appears at the bottom. The printer could easily have arranged otherwise. But if we count the letters in each of these five lines, two of them contain 33, and three of them contain 29. This looks like intention, since 33 = Bacon (S) and 29, as we saw in Chapter IV, is almost certainly an allusion to Bacon.

9		Could ſcape the haile of his all hurting ayme,	37
8		Shewing faire Nature is both kinde and tame:	36
10		And vaild in them did winne whom he would maine,	38
8	45	Againſt the thing he ſought, he would exclaime,	38
7		When he moſt burnt in hart-wiſht luxurie,	33
8		He preacht pure maide, and praiſd cold chaſtitie	40
—	50		—
8		Thus meerely with the garment of a grace,	33
7		The naked and concealed feind he couerd,	33
7		That th'vnexperient gaue the tempter place,	36
7	46	Which like a Cherubin aboue them houerd,	33
9		Who young and ſimple would not be ſo louerd,	35
9		Aye me I fell, and yet do queſtion make,	30
9		What I ſhould doe againe for ſuch a ſake.	32
—	56		—
7		O that infected moyſture of his eye,	29
10		O that falſe fire which in his cheeke ſo glowd:	37
9		O that forc'd thunder from his heart did flye,	36
8	47	O that ſad breath his ſpungie lungs beſtowed,	37
7	—	O all that borrowed motion ſeeming owed,	33
6	138	Would yet againe betray the fore-betrayed,	35
6	—	And new peruert a reconciled Maide.	29
—53			—
159			
1			
160			

FINIS.

This is a very interesting page. A preliminary count of words at once gives us :

R.W. 159 = Francis Tudor (R)
+FINIS 1

160 = Fr. Bacon (K)

So much lies on the surface. But we must extend our search. Taking each stanza separately, the following results appear :

STANZA 45
R.L. 222 = 111 × 2 ; possibly a hint.
—R.W. 50

172 = F. Bacon Kt. (K) and Shakespeare (R)

STANZA 46
R.L. 232 = Christopher Marloe (R)
—R.W. 56 = Fr. Bacon (S)

176 = W. Shakespeare (R) and Edmund Spenser (R)

STANZA 47
R.L. 236 = Christopher Marlowe (R)
+FINIS 5

241
—R.W. 54
(53 + FINIS)

187 = Prince of Wales (R)

I do not think this last signature is obtained by any undue straining of the usual methods ; but it occurred to me that if it were planned, very possibly Bacon would confirm it in some way. Such confirmation is not far to seek, seeing that the three stanza numbers of this page total 138 = Prince of Wales (S). This interpretation tends to confirm the propriety of utilizing stanza numbers on the last page but two, where we had Nos. 36, 37, 38 = 111.

On looking for acrostics in the usual way, a somewhat surprising and amusing result was disclosed :

STANZA 45
First letters of first words (S) = 52 = Greene
Ditto (R) = 98 = Greene
Ditto (K) = 156 = Greene

Last letters of first words (S) = 52 = Greene
Ditto (R) = 98 = Greene
Ditto (K) = 156 = Greene

STANZA 46

Last letters of first words (K) = 166 = Bright

STANZA 47

First letters of last words (S) = 52 = Greene.

One might imagine that, on reviewing the cipher evidence throughout this volume, Bacon thought he had not sufficiently drawn attention to Greene as one of his pen-names, and so gave a final dose to make sure we did not overlook it !

A third time in this one book, he employs the same device as in the opening lines of both *Sonnets* and *A Lovers Complaint* ; but again he carefully varies the method. Look at the last two lines.

" Would yet againe betray the fore-betrayed,
And new peruert a reconciled Maide."

Here again we notice that two of the words forming this acrostic are in themselves signatures for ;

" betray " (S) = 67 = Francis (S)
" reconciled " (R) = 166 = Francis Bacon Knight (S)

while the last word in the whole poem

" Maide " (R) = 94 = Marlowe (R)

Not only so, but with marvellous skill, the author has arranged that :

The last line but one (S) = 370 = Bacon-Shakespeare (K)
The last line of all (S) = 271 = Francis Tudor (K)

thus again emphasising, as he did at the close of the *Sonnets*, the two great secrets of his life. I cannot help thinking that the word " O," commencing five consecutive lines in the last stanza, may also have significance ; for an " O " is a nought or cipher. It almost looks as though Bacon were calling out to us five times in succession " Cipher ! " And well he might, in view of the wonderful display he has given us in these three final stanzas.

And once more, is it mere coincidence that both the first and last lines of the final stanza contain 29 letters ? This seems to link up again with " Mr. W. H." and Bacon.

We have not even yet explored all the mysteries of this last page ; for Mr. Frank Woodward pointed out that the running title has, in this single instance, been altered to " *The* Louers " instead of " *A* Louers." " No, Mr. Sceptic, it is not a careless printer's error." Francis Bacon

was a master cryptographer, and it takes all our ingenuity to follow him through the labrynths of his many cipher puzzles. This is a definite hint ; and I think the change means that the number of letters in the heading is 9 instead of 7. Further, it introduces a feature already seen, in an embryonic form, in the dedication to the *Sonnets*. Where no italic type is employed, as here, a differentiation is sometimes made between words printed entirely in capital letters and those printed in small type. Utilising this principle, we obtain two highly significant signatures :

R.W.	159	R.W.	159
—Cap. W.	2	+ Cap. L.	9
	157 = Fra. Rosicrosse (S)		168 = Fra. Rosicrosse (R)

(As previously mentioned, the use of the word FINIS is always optional.)

Thus, on the first page of the *Sonnets* we see the Rosicrucian seal 287 (K) ; it is given in duplicate on the last page of the *Sonnets* ; and here, on the last page of the whole volume, it is once more shown twice over, this time in simple and reverse ciphers.

This fact alone stamps the whole volume with authority and goes a long way towards discounting any theories of piratical publishing or careless printing.

So ends our examination of some of the long-concealed secrets in this amazing little book.

"Whether Bacon wrote the wonderful plays or not, I am quite sure the man Shakspere neither did nor could."

J. G. WHITTIER.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

IN the foregoing chapters I have endeavoured to present as clearly as possible some of the secret methods adopted by Francis Bacon for proving his authorship of pseudonymous and anonymous publications.

It is sometimes objected that if once we begin playing with figures, there is no end to the feats of juggling which may be performed, and that therefore little reliance can be placed on such methods. That this objection contains an element of truth is undeniable ; but it is only a half or quarter truth ; and this fact by no means justifies a general condemnation of all such work. It merely means that we must exercise care and discrimination, and not allow ourselves to be drawn aside into irrelevant and fanciful speculations. Throughout the present investigation I have steadily kept this in mind, and have more than once rejected evidence, because the means of obtaining it might have been considered a little arbitrary. Here and there, it is quite likely I may have misinterpreted Bacon's meaning, or given a signature which he did not intend. On the other hand, it is equally if not more probable that I may have missed something which he has hidden with unusual care. Hence it is fair to assume that the cipher evidence as a whole is at least as strong as my demonstration of it, and most likely stronger.

Some readers may have received the impression that all this elaborate cryptography is out of harmony with the nature of a poet's mind and a poetical composition, and may draw a mental picture of the author laboriously counting up letters and words and performing prodigies of mechanical calculation in order to achieve the desired result. But I am sure this would be a mistaken idea. True it is that amazing ingenuity is displayed, but " practice makes perfect" ; and

it is certain that a large proportion of this work would be done with ease, and even with relish as a relaxation *after* the creative impulse had been satisfied. Not only so, but an intelligent secretary or amanuensis would be able to give great assistance in many ways when he had become acquainted with Bacon's methods.

For example, those who are mathematically inclined will quickly discover that the three numerical codes which we have been considering possess certain relationships of which advantage may be taken. The simple and reverse ciphers are, in a sense, complementary, so that in the case of a 14 line sonnet, the two acrostic signatures will together total 14×25 or 350. Therefore when one has been calculated the other may easily be deduced. Again, in a word of 5 letters, such as *Bacon*, the reverse cipher signature is $(5 \times 25) - 33$, the simple cipher signature, $= 92$. And the K cipher signature will be $(3 \times 26) + 33$, i.e. 26 times the number of letters (B, A, C) which occur *before K*, plus the simple cipher count 33, $= 111$. But with a little experience one is soon able to add up letters in any of these codes almost as quickly as figures.

As regards signatures formed by the interplay between roman and italic types, the italicising of one or more words would probably be arranged after the composition of that page had been approximately settled, and with practice would not be a difficult matter.

Since marginal acrostics are a form of secret signature which other students do not appear to have discovered, a few more words on this subject may not be out of place. If it be objected that these signatures may easily occur by accident, the answer is that a certain number will of necessity be found in any series of poems, by the ordinary laws of probability. Therefore it is needful to distinguish between such chance signatures and those which are apparently designed by Bacon, and to which he calls our attention by sundry hints. In order to test the matter, I have been to the labour of calculating and tabulating all the possible acrostics in the whole of the sonnets which are *not* indicated by Bacon, as well as in all the stanzas in *A Lovers Complaint*. The result is very instructive ; for in these, not only are

there many sonnets containing no signatures at all, but where they do occur, the quality is poorer, if one may express it so. By this I mean that there are proportionately far fewer of the purely Bacon signatures and more of the names of his various masks. Further, they do not give the same evidence of design as those planned by Bacon ; that is to say, there are few instances of the same signature being arranged in two or three of the codes. This is a very important point. Take, for example, Sonnet 4, where Bacon shows us three of his own signatures besides a Bacon-Shakespeare one ; or the remarkable series in Sonnets 53 and 54, and again in Sonnets 125 and 126. This kind of thing indicates discrimination and purposeful planning, not chance. Note, too, that these acrostics are quite independent of any question of roman and italic types. They are inherent in the very structure of the sonnet, and hence, if designed at all, they are designed by the author and no one else.

In the case of acrostics giving knighthood signatures, we need not necessarily infer that the date of composition was subsequent to 1603, when the author was knighted, seeing that such signatures might have been formed by slight alterations in the original before the volume was published.

Again, let me remind the reader that these cipher methods are no creation of my own fancy for application to this volume of sonnets. They are to be found profusely scattered throughout the " Shakespeare " dramas, especially the 1623 Folio, in poems ascribed to Edmund Spenser, *even before Shakspere was heard of*, and in many other publications. Most important of all, I find them persistently showing in Bacon's acknowledged writings. This is another interesting point, since it again links together all these writings as emanating from the mind of a single author. Not only so, but Bacon's trusted secretary and chaplain, Dr. William Rawley, employs these same methods in *Resuscitatio* and other posthumous works which he put forth. So, too, does Archbishop Tenison in his *Baconiana* published in 1679. And lastly, they may be found in various contemporary works—emblem books for example—showing that this kind of secret writing was well understood and industriously practised in those days.

The cumulative evidence in favour of Bacon's authorship of "Shakespeare" is so overwhelming, that one is constantly tempted to indulge in digressions in order to demonstrate some point of interest. But the present little work is no place for a full discussion of other aspects of the problem. My task is now completed; and if the reader will be good enough to ponder over the material here presented, I do not fear the result. It is not easy to throw off the inevitable disinclination to change one's beliefs, especially a belief which has been established for more than three hundred years. Yet the effort should be made, not only as an act of tardy justice to the greatest figure in the world of literature, but as a recognition of truth for its own sake.

And after all, changes at least as radical as this have been made in the past and are now quietly accepted. Think what a religious upheaval must have been experienced by our grandfathers when it was first suggested that Moses did *not* write the book of Genesis. Yet this is now part and parcel of the common belief of to-day. And so it will be with the Bacon-Shakespeare question. Future generations will stand amazed at the obstinacy of our otherwise sagacious commentators over this one great problem, and will marvel that the solution was so long in being reached.

Meanwhile, it is surely the duty and the privilege of all who can shake off the shackles of a foolish orthodoxy to do what they can in the interests of truth and justice; and no more fascinating study can be imagined than one which brings the student in closest contact with the most brilliant genius known to literature and one of the most devoted benefactors of mankind. Moreover, it is not a preserve to which none but professional Shakespearean scholars can be admitted. Any one of moderate culture can find some aspect of this problem at which he can work with pleasure to himself and ultimate benefit to the fair name and reputation of the great Francis Bacon. And if this little volume can do anything to stimulate such necessary research, it will not have been written in vain.

APPENDIX A

FOR a discussion of the evidence from the writings of Marston and Hall, I cannot do better than refer the reader to Chapter II of that most interesting and scholarly work, *Is it Shakespeare?* by Rev. Walter Begley, M.A. (London : John Murray, 1903) where this author gives the clearest possible proof that Bacon was identified as the man who wrote *Venus and Adonis*. Since we have been considering questions of cipher, I may add the clinching argument on this very point, as follows. They give the nickname of "Labeo" to the author whom they are satirising and dare not name openly. Now, apart from the suitability of this name on classical grounds, the word itself counts 33, 92 and 111 in simple, reverse, and K ciphers respectively, and thus is actually a triple Bacon signature! This indicates that they had not only recognised Bacon as the concealed author of *Venus and Adonis*, but also that they were familiar with some of Bacon's cipher methods.[1]

The following evidence of Marston is equally emphatic ; for Mr. Begley points to the line addressed by him to Hall :

"What, not *mediocria firma* from thy spite ?"

in other words, "Has not even *mediocria firma* escaped thy spite ?" When we know that these two words were Bacon's family motto, the evidence becomes something very near to demonstration. But orthodox editors quietly ignore such deadly passages as these, and still go on asserting that there is no contemporary evidence pointing to Bacon as the true "Shake-speare."

Ben Jonson's evidence *as a whole* is, contrary to popular belief, strongly on the Baconian side. Here I may just refer to Act 1, Scene 1 of *The Poetaster*, where "Ovid Junior," the young author whose father forces him against his inclinations to study the law and ridicules his poetical fancies, is unmistakably a hit at Francis Bacon. As regards Jonson's prefatory matter in the 1623 Shakespeare Folio, the whole of it is packed full of cipher evidence pointing to Bacon as the true author. But this is a large subject.

[1] Investigating along entirely different lines, Mr. William Stone Booth has also given strong grounds for identifying Bacon as the writer of *Venus and Adonis*, in his elaborate work, *Some Acrostic Signatures of Francis Bacon* (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1909).

41001

APPENDIX B

The remainder of the pages on which italicised words occur; with the signatures thereon.

6 Gainſt death, and all obliuious emnity
10 Shall you pace forth, your praiſe ſhall ſtil finde roome,
7 Euen in the eyes of all poſterity
9 That weare this world out to the ending doome.
8 So til the iudgement that your ſelfe ariſe,
9–49 You liue in this, and dwell in louers eies.

56

9 SWeet loue renew thy force, be it not ſaid
7 Thy edge ſhould blunter be then apetite,
8 Which but too daie by feeding is alaied,
7 To morrow ſharpned in his former might.
9 So loue be thou, although too daie thou fill
9 Thy hungrie eies, euen till they winck with fulneſſe,
8 Too morrow ſee againe, and doe not kill
8 The ſpirit of Loue, with a perpetual dulneſſe: 1.W.
7 Let this ſad *Intrim* like the Ocean be 1
8 Which parts the ſhore, where two contracted new,
9 Come daily to the banckes, that when they ſee:
9 Returne of loue, more bleſt may be the view.
9 As cal it Winter, which being ful of care,
8–115 Makes Sõmers welcome, thrice more wiſh'd, more rare:

57

9 BEing your ſlaue what ſhould I doe but tend,
8 Vpon the houres, and times of your deſire?
9 I haue no precious time at al to ſpend;
7 Nor feruices to doe til you require.
9 Nor dare I chide the world without end houre,
9 Whilſt I (my ſoueraine) watch the clock for you,
7 Nor thinke the bitterneſſe of abſence ſowre,
8 VVhen you haue bid your ſeruant once adieue,
8 Nor dare I queſtion with my ieallous thought,
8 VVhere you may be, or your affaires ſuppoſe,
10 But like a ſad ſlaue ſtay and thinke of nought
9 Saue where you are, how happy you make thoſe.
10 So true a foole is loue, that in your Will,
9 (Though you doe any thing) he thinkes no ill.
—120 58

284

WHOLE PAGE

R.W. 284 = Francis Bacon Knight (R)
—I.L. 6

278 = George Peele (K)

SONNET 56 (= Fr. Bacon S)

R.W. 115
+I.W. 1

116 = ? a covert allusion to Bacon. See last line of Dedication.

ACROSTIC

SONNET 56

Last letters of last words (S) = 126 = Robert Greene.

I think it is worth noting that Sonnets 33 and 39 are not earmarked as having signatures planned in them, and this Sonnet 56 contains very little. These three numbers in simple cipher represent *Bacon*, *F. Bacon*, and *Fr. Bacon* respectively; and if any inquisitive person had been suspecting the identity of the author, he might very naturally have turned to these sonnets as the most likely place to find evidence. Hence, I suggest that the careful Francis purposely avoided giving such an easy clue.

8 The vacant leaues thy mindes imprint will beare,
9 And of this booke, this learning maiſt thou taſte,
8 The wrinckles which thy glaſſe will truly ſhow,
7 Of mouthed graues will giue thee memorie,
8 Thou by thy dyals ſhady ſtealth maiſt know,
5 Times theeuiſh progreſſe to eternitie.
6 Looke what thy memorie cannot containe,
9 Commit to theſe waſte blacks, and thou ſhalt finde
7 Thoſe children nurſt, deliuerd from thy braine,
8 To take a new acquaintance of thy minde.
8 Theſe offices, ſo oft as thou wilt looke,
8–91 Shall profit thee and much inrich thy booke.

78

9 SO oft haue I inuok'd thee for my Muſe,
8 And found ſuch faire aſſiſtance in my verſe, 1.w.
7 As euery *Alien* pen hath got my vſe, 1
6 And vnder thee their poeſie diſperſe.
10 Thine eyes, that taught the dumbe on high to ſing,
6 And he auie ignorance aloft to flie,
7 Haue added fethers to the learneds wing,
6 And giuen grace a double Maieſtie,
9 Yet be moſt proud of that which I compile,
8 Whoſe influence is thine, and borne of thee,
9 In others workes thou dooſt but mend the ſtile,
8 And Arts with thy ſweete graces graced be.
9 But thou art all my art, and dooſt aduance
y–109 As high as learning, my rude ignorance.

79

8 *W*Hilſt I alone did call vpon thy ayde,
8 My verſe alone had all thy gentle grace,
7 But now my gracious numbers are decayde,
9 And my ſick Muſe doth giue an other place.
7 I grant (ſweet loue) thy louely argument
7 Deſerues the trauaile of a worthier pen,
8 Yet what of thee thy Poet doth inuent,
9–63 He robs thee of, and payes it thee againe,

R.W. 263
+I.W. 1

264 = Bacon-Shakespeare (R)

Here there is nothing in Sonnet 78 by itself, and so quite possibly we are meant, as previously suggested, to take a section of the page.

SONNETS 77 and 78

R.W. 91 = Spenser (S)
and 109

200 = Francis Bacon (R)

or perhaps :

R.W 109
and 63

172 = F. Bacon Kt. (K)
+I.L 5 and Shakespeare (R)

177 = William Shakespeare (S)

Indeed both may be intended.

ACROSTIC

SONNET 78

Last letters of first words (S) = 136 = Bacon-Shakespeare and Wm Shakespeare.

9 Thy loue is bitter then high birth to me,
7 Richer then wealth, prouder then garments coſt,
8 Of more delight then Hawkes or Horſes bee:
9 And hauing thee, of all mens pride I boast.
8 Wretched in this alone, that thou maiſt take,
8–49 All this away, and me moſt wretched make.

92

9 BVt doe thy worſt to ſteale thy ſelfe away,
8 For tearme of life thou art aſſured mine,
9 And life no longer then thy loue will ſtay,
8 For it depends vpon that loue of thine.
10 Then need I not to feare the worſt of wrongs,
10 When in the leaſt of them my life hath end,
8 I ſee, a better ſtate to me belongs
8 Then that, which on thy humor doth depend.
8 Thou canſt not vex me with inconſtant minde,
9 Since that my life on thy reuolt doth lie,
8 Oh what a happy title do I finde,
8 Happy to haue thy loue, happy to die!
9 But whats ſo bleſſed faire that feares no blot,
10–122 Thou maiſt be falce, and yet I know it not.

93

8 SO ſhall I liue, ſuppoſing thou art true,
7 Like a deceiued husband ſo loues face,
9 May ſtill seeme loue to me, though alter'd new:
9 Thy lookes with me, thy heart in other place.
9 For their can liue no hatred in thine eye,
8 Therefore in that I cannot know thy change,
7 In manies lookes, the falce hearts hiſtory
9 Is writ in moods and frounes and wrinckles ſtrange.
7 But heauen in thy creation did decree,
9 That in thy face ſweet loue ſhould euer dwell,
9 What ere thy thoughts, or thy hearts workings be,
8 Thy lookes ſhould nothing thence, but ſweetneſſe tell, I.W.
7 How like *Eaues* apple doth thy beauty grow, I
8–114 If thy ſweet vertue anſwere not thy ſhow.

94

WHOLE PAGE

R.W. 285
—I.W. 1

284 = Francis Bacon Knight (R)

R.W. 285
—I.L. 5

280 = W. Shakespeare (K)

SONNET 93

R.W. 114
—I.W. 1

113 = Puttenham (R)

R.W. 114
+I.L. 5

119 = Fr. Bacon (R)

ACROSTIC

SONNET 93

First letters of last words (S) = 141 = Francis Tudor.

It is perhaps worth noting that the upper half of the page totals 171 words = Francis (K); and that the lower half consists of three groups of 33 words = Bacon (S), followed by the last two lines containing 67 *letters* = Francis (S).

The baſeſt iewell wil be well eſteem'd:
So are thoſe errors that in thee are ſeene,
To truths tranſlated, and for true things deem'd.
How many Lambs might the ſterne Wolfe betray,
If like a Lambe he could his lookes tranſlate,
How many gazers mighſt thou lead away,
If thou wouldſt vſe the ſtrength of all thy ſtate?
But doe not ſo, I loue thee in ſuch ſort,
As thou being mine, mine is thy good report.

97

How like a Winter hath my abſence beene
From thee, the pleaſure of the fleeting yeare?
What freezings haue I felt, what darke daies ſeene?
What old Decembers bareneſſe euery where?
And yet this time remou'd was ſommers time,
The teeming Autumne big with ritch increaſe,
Bearing the wanton burthen of the prime,
Like widdowed wombes after their Lords deceaſe:
Yet this aboundant iſſue ſeem'd to me,
But hope of Orphans, and vn-fathered fruite,
For Sommer and his pleaſures waite on thee,
And thou away, the very birds are mute.
Of if they ſing, tis with ſo dull a cheere,
That leaues looke pale, dreading the Winters neere.

98

From you haue I beene abſent in the ſpring,
When proud pide Aprill (dreſt in all his trim)
Hath put a ſpirit of youth in euery thing: I.W.
That heauie *Saturne* laught and leapt with him, I
Yet nor the laies of birds, nor the ſweet ſmell
Of different flowers in odor and in hew,
Could make me any ſummers ſtory tell:
Or from their proud lap pluck them where they grew:
Nor did I wonder at the Lillies white,
Nor praiſe the deepe vermillion in the Roſe,
They weare but ſweet, but figures of delight:

WHOLE PAGE

R.W.	278	
—I.L.	7	
	271	= Francis Tudor (K)
R.W.	278	
+I.W.	1	
	279	= Edmund Spenser (K)

SONNET 98

R.W.	93	
—I.W.	1	
	92	= Bacon (R)
R.W.	93	
+I.W.	1	
	94	= Marlowe (R)
R.W.	93	
+I.L.	7	
	100	= Francis Bacon (S)

This is the only instance in the book where there appear to be no marginal acrostics on the ear-marked page alone. If we turn over the page and take the whole of Sonnet 98, we do obtain them. Bacon's usual practice is to take each page by itself, independently of the sense of the words, and the strong triple acrostic in Sonnet 53 seems good evidence of this. Hence one cannot say whether he is deliberately varying his custom, perhaps to test the decipherer, or whether, for some reason, he has planned no acrostic on this page.

8 Drawne after you, you patterne of all thoſe.
8 Yet ſeem'd it Winter ſtill, and you away,
9–25 As with your ſhaddow I with theſe did play.

99

7 THe forward violet thus did I chide,
10 Sweet theefe whence didſt thou ſteale thy ſweet that
9 If not from my loues breath, the purple pride, (ſmels
8 Which on thy ſoft cheeke for complexion dwells?
9 In my loues veines thou haſt too groſely died,
7 The Lillie I condemned for thy hand,
8 And buds of marierom had ſtolne thy haire,
7 The Roſes fearefully on thornes did ſtand,
7 Our bluſhing ſhame, an other white diſpaire:
10 A third nor red, nor white, had ſtolne of both,
8 And to his robbry had annext thy breath,
10 But for this theft in pride of all his growth
8 A vengfull canker eate him vp to death.
9 More flowers I noted, yet I none could ſee,
9–126 But ſweet, or culler it had ſtolne from thee.

100

9 VVHere art thou Muſe that thou forgetſt ſo long,
10 To ſpeake of that which giues thee all thy might?
8 Spendſt thou thy furie on ſome worthleſſe ſonge,
8 Darkning thy powre to lend baſe ſubiects light,
6 Returne forgetfull Muſe, and ſtraight redeeme,
7 In gentle numbers time ſo idely ſpent,
9 Sing to the eare that doth thy laies eſteeme,
8 And giues thy pen both skill and argument.
8 Riſe reſty Muſe, my loues ſweet face ſuruay,
7 If time haue any wrincle grauen there, I.W.
6 If any, be a *Satire* to decay, I
7 And make times ſpoiles diſpiſed euery where.
9 Giue my loue fame faſter then time waſts life,
8–110 So thou preuenſt his ſieth, and crooked knife.

101

7– 7 OH truant Muſe what ſhalbe thy amends,

This page is an exceptional one, for the reason that Sonnet 99 contains 15 lines instead of the normal 14. Whether this fact has any connection with the construction of the cipher signatures and has resulted in a miscount, one cannot say ; but I find nothing in the page as a whole. If we take the lower section, then :

SONNET 100
and part 101

R.W. 117
—I.L. 6

111 = Bacon (K)

SONNET 100

R.W. 110
+I.W. 1

111 = Bacon (K)

Possibly the fact that the sonnet number (100) = Francis Bacon (S) is again a reason for not revealing too much on this page.

ACROSTICS

SONNET 100

First letters of last words (R) = 174 = Robert Greene
Last letters of first words (R) = 236 = Christopher Marlowe

For thy neglect of truth in beauty di'd?
Both truth and beauty on my loue depends:
So doſt thou too, and therein dignifi'd:
Make anſwere Muſe, wilt thou not haply ſaie,
Truth needs no collour with his collour fixt,
Beautie no penſell, beauties truth to lay:
But beſt is beſt, if neuer intermixt.
Becauſe he needs no praiſe, wilt thou be dumb?
Excuſe not ſilence ſo, for't lies in thee,
To make him much out-liue a gilded tombe:
And to be praiſd of ages yet to be.
Then do thy office Muſe, I teach thee how,
To make him ſeeme long hence, as he ſhowes now.

102

MY loue is ſtrengthned though more weake in ſee-
I loue not leſſe, thogh leſſe theſhow appeare, (ming
That loue is marchandiz'd, whoſe ritch eſteeming,
The owners tongue doth publiſh euery where.
Our loue was new, and then but in the ſpring,
When I was wont to greet it with my laies, I.W
As *Philomell* in ſummers front doth ſinge, I
And ſtops his pipe in growth of riper daies:
Not that the ſummer is leſſe pleaſant now
Then when her mournefull himns did huſh the night,
But that wild muſick burthens euery bow,
And sweets growne common looſe their deare delight.
Therefore like her, I ſome-time hold my tongue:
Because I would not dull you with my ſonge.

103

ALack what pouerty my Muſe brings forth,
That hauing ſuch a skope toſhow her pride,
The argument all bare is of more worth
Then when it hath my added praiſe beſide.
Oh blame me not if I no more can write!
Looke in your glaſſe and there appeares a face,
That ouer-goes my blunt inuention quite,
Dulling my lines, and doing me disgrace.

WHOLE PAGE

R.W. 287 = Fra. Rosicrosse (K)
—I.L. 9

278 = George Peele (K)

I find nothing in Sonnet 102 alone, unless 116 is, once more, a side-long reference to "Mr. W. H." and Bacon; but if we are meant to take 102 and 103 together, then:

R.W. 180
+I.L. 9

189 = Fr. Bacon Kt. (K) and Wm. Shakespeare (R)

R.W. 180
—I.L. 9

171 = Francis (K)

Note that 103 = Shakespeare (S)

ACROSTIC

SONNET 102

Last letters of last words (K) = 370 = Bacon-Shakespeare.

R.W

118

8 LIke as to make our appetites more keene
7 With eager compounds we our pallat vrge,
6 As to preuent our malladies vnſeene,
8 We ſicken to ſhun ſickneſſe when we purge,
9 Euen ſo being full of your nere cloying ſweetneſſe,
8 To bitter ſawces did I frame my feeding;
9 And ſicke of wel-fare found a kind of meerneſſe,
9 To be diſeaſ'd ere that there was true needing
6 Thus pollicie in loue t'anticipate
9 The ills that were, not grew to faults aſſured,
7 And brought to medicine a healthfull ſtate
9 Which rancke of goodneſſe would by ill be cured.
9 But thence I learne and find the leſſon true,
9–113 Drugs poyſon him that ſo fell ſicke of you.

119

I.W.

7 WHat potions haue I drunke of *Syren* teares
7 Diſtil'd from Lymbecks foule as hell within,
8 Applying feares to hopes, and hopes to feares,
9 Still looſing when I ſaw my ſelfe to win?
7 What wretched errors hath my heart committed,
9 Whilſt it hath thought it ſelfe ſo bleſſed neuer?
9 How haue mine eies out of their Spheares bene fitted
7 In the diſtraction of this madding feuer?
8 O benefit of ill, now I find true
8 That better is, by euil ſtill made better.
8 And ruin'd loue when it is built anew
9 Growes fairer then at firſt, more ſtrong, far greater.
7 So I returne rebukt to my content,
10–113 And gaine by ills thriſe more then I haue spent.

120

8 THat you were once vnkind be-friends mee now,
9 And for that ſorrow, which I then didde feele,
7 Needes muſt I vnder my tranſgreſſion bow,
8 Vnleſſe my Nerues were braſſe or hammered ſteele,
8–40 For if you were by my vnkindneſſe ſhaken

As

WHOLE PAGE

R.W. 266
+I.L. 5

271 = Francis Tudor (K)

SONNET 119

R.W. 113 = Puttenham (R)
—I.W. 1

112 = Puttenham (S)

Note that Sonnet 118 also contains 113 Roman words. This seems strong confirmation of the Puttenham signatures in Sonnet 114.

ACROSTIC

SONNET 119 (= Fr. Bacon R)

Last letters of last words (K) = 280 = W. Shakespeare.

8 To truſt thoſe tables that receaue thee more
7 To keepe an adiunckt to remember thee,
6—21 Were to import forgetfulneſſe in mee.

123

10 NO! Time, thou ſhalt not boſt that I doe change,
7 They pyramyds buylt vp with newer might
7 To me are nothing nouell, nothing ſtrange,
8 They are but dreſſings of a former ſight:
8 Our dates are breefe, and therefor we admire,
9 What thou doſt foyſt vpon vs that is ould,
8 And rather make them borne to our deſire,
9 Then thinke that we before haue heard them tould:
7 Thy regiſters and thee I both defie,
8 Not wondring at the preſent, nor the paſt,
9 For thy records, and what we ſee doth lye,
8 Made more or les by thy continuall haſt:
9 This I doe vow and this ſhall euer be,
9–116 I will be true diſpight thy ſyeth and thee.

124

10 YF my deare loue were but the childe of ſtate,
7 It might for fortunes baſterd be vnfathered,
9 As subiect to times loue, or to times hate,
8 Weeds among weeds, or flowers with flowers gatherd,
7 No it was buylded far from accident,
8 It suffers not in ſmilinge pomp, nor falls
6 Vnder the blow of thralled diſcontent,
7 Whereto th'inuiting time our faſhion calls: I.W.
5 It feares not policy that *Heriticke*, I
8 Which workes on leaſes of ſhort numbred howers,
6 But all alone ſtands hugely pollitick.
10 That it nor growes with heat, nor drownes with ſhowers.
9 To this I witnes call the foles of time,
9–109 Which die for goodnes, who haue liu'd for crime.

125

9 VVEr't ought to me I bore the canopy,
6–15 With my extern the outward honoring.

261

Here is another case where the whole page seems to yield nothing. If we take the lower section, then :

R.W. 109
and 15
124 = W. Shakespeare (S)

R.W. 124
+I.L. 9
133 = Marlowe (K)

SONNET 124 (= W. Shakespeare S)

R.W. 109
—I.L. 9
100 = Francis Bacon (S)

ACROSTIC

SONNET 124

First letters of last words (S) = 138 = Prince of Wales.

R.W.

142

9 LOue is my ſinne, and thy dearer vertue hate,
8 Hate of my ſinne, grounded on ſinfull louing,
9 O but with mine, compare thou thine owne ſtate,
8 And thouſhalt finde it merrits not reproouing,
10 Or if it do, not from thoſe lips of thine,
6 That haue prophan'd their ſcarlet ornaments,
10 And ſeald falſe bonds of loue as oft as mine,
7 Robd others beds reuenues of their rents.
10 Be it lawfull I loue thee as thou lou'ſt thoſe.
8 Whome thine eyes wooe as mine importune thee,
9 Roote pittie in thy heart that when it growes,
7 Thy pitty may deſerue to pittied bee.
10 If thou dooſt ſeeke to haue what thou dooſt hide.
7–1 By ſelfe example mai'ſt thou be denide.

143

8 LOe as a carefull huſwife runnes to catch,
7 One of her fethered creatures broake away,
9 Sets downe her babe and makes all ſwift diſpatch
9 In purſuit of the thing ſhe would haue ſtay:
8 Whilſt her neglected child holds her in chace,
9 Cries to catch her whoſe buſie care is bent,
8 To follow that which flies before her face:
6 Not prizing her poore infants diſcontent;
9 So runſt thou after that which flies from thee,
9 Whilſt I thy babe chace thee a farre behind,
10 But if thou catch thy hope turne back to me:
9 And play the mothers part kiſſe me, be kind.
9 So will I pray that thou maiſt haue thy *Will*,
9–119 If thou turne back and my loude crying ſtill.

I.W.
I

144

8 TWo loues I haue of comfort and diſpaire,
8 Which like two ſpirits do ſugieſt me ſtill,
8 The better angell is a man right faire:
7 The worſer ſpirit a woman collour'd il.
9–40 To win me ſoone to hell my femall euill,

Tempteth

As the page total here only gives :

R.W. 277
+I.W. 1

278 = George Peele (K)

we are probably meant also to take the lower section by itself, thus :

R.W. 119
and 40

159 = Francis Tudor (R)

SONNET 143
R.W. 119 = Fr. Bacon (R)

ACROSTICS

SONNET 143

First letters of first words (S) = 177 = William Shakespeare
Last letters of last words (R) = 200 = Francis Bacon

9 But ryſing at thy name doth point out thee,
8 As his triumphant prize, proud of this pride,
8 He is contented thy poore drudge to be
9 To ſtand in thy affaires, fall by thy ſide.
9 No want of conſcience hold it that I call,
10–53 Her loue, for whoſe deare loue I riſe and fall.

152

8 IN louing thee thou know'ſt I am forſworne,
9 But thou art twice forſworne to me loue ſwearing,
9 In act thy bed-vow broake and new faith torne,
8 In vowing new hate after new loue bearing :
10 But why of two othes breach doe I accuſe thee,
8 When I breake twenty: I am periur'd moſt,
10 For all my vowes are othes but to miſuſe thee:
9 And all my honeſt faith in thee is loſt.
10 For I haue ſworne deepe othes of thy deepe kindneſſe:
8 Othes of thy loue, thy truth, thy conſtancie,
8 And to inlighten thee gaue eyes to blindneſſe,
9 Or made them ſwere againſt the thing they ſee.
9 For I haue ſworne thee faire: more periurde eye,
9–124 To ſwere againſt the truth so foule a lie.

153 I.W.

8 *CVpid* laid by his brand and fell a ſleepe,
6 A maide of *Dyans* this aduantage found,
7 And his loue-kindling fire did quickly ſteepe
7 In a could vallie-fountaine of that ground:
8 Which borrowed from this holie fire of loue,
7 A dateleſſe liuely heat ſtill to indure,
9 And grew a ſeething bath which yet men proue,
6 Againſt ſtrang malladies a ſoueraigne cure:
9 But at my miſtres eie loues brand new fired,
9 The boy for triall needes would touch my breſt,
8 I ſick withall the helpe of bath deſired,
7 And thether hied a ſad diſtemperd gueſt,
10 But found no cure, the bath for my helpe lies,
7–108 Where *Cupid* got new fire; my miſtres eye.

This, the penultimate page, contains good evidence, though small in compass.

WHOLE PAGE

R.W. 285
—I.W. 3

282 = Francis Bacon (K)

R.W. 285
—I.L. 14

271 = Francis Tudor (K)

SONNET 153

R.W. 108
—I.L. 14

94 = Marlowe (R)

R.W. 108
+I.W. 3

111 = Bacon (K)

ACROSTIC

SONNET 153

Last letters of first words (K) = 375 = Christopher Marloe.

SHAKESPEARE AND CHAPMAN AS TOPICAL DRAMATISTS

Being a further study of Elizabethan Dramatic Origins and Imitations.

By

PERCY ALLEN

Author of "Shakespeare, Jonson and Wilkins as Borrowers"

Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net. Cloth

"Clearly expounded and skilfully and temperately argued, it makes out a convincing case . . ."—*Scotsman.*

"A courageous and living piece of literary criticism."—*T.P.'s Weekly*

". . . Few readers . . . will put it down without feeling admiration for the author's great knowledge of his subject and gratitude for the new and stimulating points of view that are presented."—*Nottingham Guardian.*

SHAKESPEARE, JONSON AND WILKINS AS BORROWERS

A STUDY IN DRAMATIC ORIGINS AND IMITATIONS

By

PERCY ALLEN

With an Introduction by Prof. R. P. Cowl

7s. 6d. net

A dramatic critic, by reason of long familiarity with the theatre, will often see further into a play than those whose knowledge is more academic and less practical than his, and in fact it was not by reading but by attending performances of Elizabethan plays that Mr. Allen perceived how little explored as yet was the field of Elizabethan dramatic borrowing. In this book, which must be taken account of by Shakespearean and Jonsonian students who would bring themselves to date, Mr. Allen seeks to show the indebtedness of these dramatists to each other and to their contemporaries.

CECIL PALMER:
49 CHANDOS STREET, LONDON, W.C.2

SHAKESPEARE UNMASKED

THE SELF-NAMED WILLIAM SHAKE-SPEARE
THE PRINCE OF WALES
BORN LEGITIMATE AND UNACKNOWLEDGED:
SON OF H.M. QUEEN ELIZABETH AND
THE EARL OF LEICESTER:
BAPTISED IN THE FALSE NAME OF
FRANCIS BACON:
PHILOSOPHER, DRAMATIST, POET AND ARCH-MARTYR
THEREAFTER NAMED
VSICOUNT ST. ALBANS

By

ALFRED MUDIE

Demy 8vo. 5s. net Boards.

THE SHAKESPEARE MYSTERY

By

PRO. GEORGES CONNES

(University of Dijon)

(Abridged and translated into English by a Member of the Shakespeare Fellowship)

Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net. Cloth.

"To summarize in less than 300 pages the innumerable and not infrequently tedious and complicated arguments in favour of this or that claimant for Shakespeare honours, and to give due weight to each one, was a task calling for peculiar qualities; fortunate in possessing them, M. Connes has written a book of value to students of Shakespeare and of real interest even to those who care not at all whether Shakespeare or another wrote the plays."—*Times Literary Supplement.*

CECIL PALMER:
49 CHANDOS STREET, LONDON, W.C.2

THE SHAKESPEARE CONTROVERSY

The Stratford Bust and the Droeshout Engraving

By

SIR GEORGE GREENWOOD

Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net Cloth.

The book presents a clear sifting of evidence carried to a logical conclusion, as to the authenticity or otherwise of the Stratford Bust and the Droeshout Engraving as true portraits of the Great Poet.

⊛

"SHAKESPEARE" IDENTIFIED IN EDWARD DE VERE, the Seventeenth Earl of Oxford.—By. J. THOMAS LOONEY. Demy 8vo. 21s. net.

THE POEMS OF EDWARD DE VERE, Seventeenth Earl of Oxford. With Biographical Notice, Introduction to the Poems and Notes by J. THOMAS LOONEY. Demy 8vo. 7s. net.

BEN JONSON AND SHAKESPEARE.—By SIR GEORGE GREENWOOD. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.

SHAKESPEARE'S LAW.—By SIR GEORGE GREENWOOD. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.

LEE, SHAKESPEARE, AND A TERTIUM QUID.—By SIR GEORGE GREENWOOD. Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

SHAKESPEARE'S SIGNATURES AND "SIR THOMAS MORE."—By SIR GEORGE GREENWOOD. Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

SHAKESPEARE THROUGH OXFORD GLASSES.—By CAPTAIN H. H. HOLLAND, C.B. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

BACONIAN ESSAYS.—By EDWARD W. SMITHSON. Edited, with an Introduction and two Essays, by Sir GEORGE GREENWOOD. Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.

THE MYSTERY OF "MR. W. H."—By COLONEL B. R. WARD, C.M.G. With 12 Illustrations. F'cap. 4to. 10s. 6d. net.

THE COUNTESSE OF PEMBROKE'S ARCADIA: Examined and Discussed by the late EDWARD GEORGE HARMAN, C.B. With a chapter on Thomas Lodge. Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.

THE IMPERSONALITY OF SHAKESPEARE.—By the late EDWARD GEORGE HARMAN, C.B. Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.

CECIL PALMER:
49 CHANDOS STREET, LONDON, W.C.2

2811X

CNTI 7-74

T TBK PR2944 .T27
Theobald, Bertram Gordon
Shake-speare s sonnets unmasked,
Weiner Library/Fairleigh Dickinson Univ.
Teaneck, NJ 07666
3 3208 00252 6465

P7-BBC-154